In The Matter Of:

BROOKLINE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS HEARING

PROCEEDINGS - Vol. 20 December 22, 2014

MERRILL CORPORATION

LegaLink, Inc.

101 Arch Street 3rd Floor Boston, MA 02110 Phone: 617.542.0039 Fax: 617.542.2119

Volume XX

Pages 1-59

Brookline Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing

Case Number 20130094

40B Application by Chestnut Hill Realty

The Residences of South Brookline

December 22, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

Office of Town Counsel

333 Washington Street, 6th floor

Brookline, Massachusetts 02445

Merrill Corporation LegaLink, Inc.

179 Lincoln Street, Suite 401

Boston, Massachusetts 02111

(617) 542-0039 Fax (617) 542-2119

Reporter: Kristen C. Krakofsky

```
1
                            Appearances
 2.
      Board Members:
      Jesse Geller, Chairman
      Jonathan Book
 5
      Chris Hussey
      Mark Zuroff, Associate Member
 6
 7
 8
      Allison Steinfeld, Planning Director
 9
      Kathryn Cochrane Murphy, Esquire, Krokidas & Bluestein
10
      Edith M. Netter, Esquire,
11
      Edith M. Netter & Associates, P.C.
12
      Dan Bennett, Building Commissioner
13
      Joseph Geller, Stantec Consulting
14
      Marc Levin, Chestnut Hill Realty
15
      Steven Schwartz, Esquire, Goulston & Storrs
16
17
      Members of the Public:
18
      William Pu, 249 Beverly Road
19
      Steven Chiumenti, 262 Russett Road
20
      Abby Cox, 18 Osborne Road
21
      Joyce Wong
22
      Neil Wishinsky
23
      Judith Leichtner, 121 Beverly Road
24
      Ruben Pollard, 243 Beverly Road
```

Page 3

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	7:11 p.m.
3	MR. JESSE GELLER: Good evening, everyone. We
4	are calling the continued hearing on the Residences of
5	Chestnut Hill. Tonight is December 22nd. The
6	applicant has provided us with an extension through
7	this evening, which begs a request for a further
8	extension through January 5th.
9	Will your client grant a further extension?
10	The basis is that I understand that later this week we
11	will be receiving final corrected plans. Is that a
12	correct
13	MR. LEVIN: I believe they've been submitted.
14	MR. SCHWARTZ: All submitted.
15	MS. STEINFELD: Not hard copies yet, as far as
16	we know.
17	MR. JESSE GELLER: Hard copies?
18	MR. LEVIN: Well, electronically it's been
19	received. I think that we can when do you need it?
20	Tomorrow? Tomorrow.
21	MS. NETTER: This is my understanding. May I
22	supplement, please?
23	MR. JESSE GELLER: Please.
24	MS. NETTER: My understanding is that the

Page 4

applicant submitted a fairly complete set of plans. 1 2 don't know what date it was. I'll let Maria update --Ms. Morelli. And then the town sent back to the applicant a very long checklist of things that needed 5 to be done to the plans and the applicant, it's my understanding, has responded electronically and will 6 respond with hard copy. But at this juncture, the town 8 has to review all those plans to make sure whether they comply with the requests, so that will take some time 10 to do that; correct? Have I gotten the full story? 11 MS. MORELLI: Yes. 12 MS. NETTER: And you believe that, given the 13 holidays, you need an extension until January 5th is 14 what the request is. 1.5 I'm seeing an affirmative nod, Mr. Levin. 16 Does that mean yes? 17 MR. LEVIN: Well, assuming that that is the 18 sole purpose for the extension as opposed to getting a 19 list of comments back again and then submitting again 20 and then asking for another extension to review those 21 comments, then --22 MS. NETTER: I'm hoping this is the final 23 request, but it's really -- assuming the plans that 24 have been submitted meet the checklist, then there will

be no other requests for extensions. And if they 1 2 don't, then we have to proceed from there. MR. SCHWARTZ: Well, it was a nine-page letter. But for the most part, the changes that were 5 requested were fairly, you know, in a -- almost in the nature of, you know, errors or corrections more so than 6 real substantive changes to the plan. So it's been my experience, at least at some point, the board closes the hearing and says we have 9 10 all the plans we need. And to the extent that there 11 needs to be further corrections or amendments, those can be in the conditions, either specifically or 12 13 generically. 14 So the concern is, you know, we're obviously 15 not going to, you know, hold things up over a two-week 16 extension, but the concern is you can always have 17 further comments on plans, and so at some point the process really, in fairness, ought to end where we've 18 19 said we've submitted what we're submitting. 20 MS. NETTER: Some of your comments were --21 some of the issues were more than administerial. If 22 you'd like, Maria can articulate some of those, but 23 let's just perhaps move on and not belabor how we 24 characterize the changes on the checklist. But the

```
idea is to close the hearing, assuming the substantive
 1
 2
      issues have been addressed.
               Does that work for you, Mr. Levin?
               MR. LEVIN: Yes, it does.
 5
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Do we have an answer?
 6
               MS. NETTER: I heard a yes.
               MR. JESSE GELLER:
                                 Yes? Thank you.
               Just to make clear to everyone, CHR has
      submitted a full set of plans in electronic format, and
 9
10
      what the ask is is that a hard set of the plans with
11
      some corrections based on notes -- on a review -- the
      list was already provided, and that's what we are
12
13
      waiting on.
14
               Do I need to say that planning will review
15
      them once they're submitted?
16
               MS. NETTER: No. But they will do that.
17
               MR. JESSE GELLER: I think that's obvious.
18
               MR. BOOK: May I ask a question?
19
               MR. JESSE GELLER:
                                 Sure.
20
               MR. BOOK: Are we then -- is there a
21
      hearing -- a continued hearing scheduled for that
22
      extension?
23
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Yes. It raises, of
24
      course -- it begs the question of when's the next
```

hearing. The next hearing will be January 5th at the

Page 7

- 2 same time, 7:00 p.m., and the notion is that when those questions have been responded to and essentially the checklist is completed, the hearing will, at that 5 point, be closed. MR. HUSSEY: Do I understand from the 6 applicant, though, that he has already made those 8 corrections? MR. JESSE GELLER: I believe he's saying they've done it in electronic format. 10 11 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. 12 MR. SCHWARTZ: The letter that was submitted 13 by Stantec today indicating -- in which there's a 14 handful of items that we said that we were not doing
- But other than that ...
- 17 MR. HUSSEY: There was one question I had that

and it explained why. There were four or five items.

- 18 I'd like to -- pertains to the drawings, actually, and
- 19 that is, there were certain sections which showed the
- 20 sections through the buildings and it showed the height
- 21 from the first floor to the peak of the roof. And I
- 22 was wondering if those could show the height from the
- grade to the peak of the roof. Is that possible? From
- 24 the grade around the -- I know some of the sections

1

15

apply to a lot of different buildings, so maybe it's 1 2 not possible. MR. JOE GELLER: Joe Geller from Stantec. I think that what the challenge would be is 5 that if you take -- that's why you take the section, because the grades go differently all the way around 6 the building and that's the point of the whole height 8 calculation --MR. HUSSEY: Right. 10 MR. JOE GELLER: -- is that you see that based 11 on the calculation all the way around the building. So 12 that's a better place to try to understand that. 13 MR. HUSSEY: I noticed it is in the 14 calculations for height that's in the waiver request. 15 So that's where it shows --16 MR. JOE GELLER: Yeah. It shows, as you go 17 around each building, what the average grade is. 18 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. I'll back off. 19 MR. JOE GELLER: You want to see that from 20 point to point? Is that what you're asking? 21 MR. HUSSEY: Well, I'd like to see a graph. 22 I'm a graphic kind of guy, but I'll back off because I 23 know it's complicated. 24 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. I'd like to call on

Page 9

the building commissioner to speak to one particular 1 2 issue, which is height. MR. BENNETT. Good evening, Dan Bennett Building Commissioner. 5 The issue of height has come up by some residents in the last few weeks, and I'll just 6 reiterate what I said a few weeks ago when we discussed waivers briefly, that I did review -- Building Department and Planning Department staff reviewed the list of waivers and the method by which the applicant 10 11 used to determine height, and we find that is it 12 consistent with the bylaw and is properly applied. 13 I would further ask that the applicant -- I 14 think what might confuse some of the issue is they --15 for the midrise building, they keep providing an alternative calculation that shows a distance of 176 16 17 feet or so to an abutting lot line and they back into a formula where they indicate that the waiver may not be 18 required. And we had set that issue aside a while 19 20 back. We didn't agree with that calculation for using 21 that lot line. So going forward, if they would just -- if 22 23 they do the new waiver list, that alternate calc, I 24 think, does confuse the issue. And if they just stick

with the table they've got that shows Building 12 ten 1 2 feet from the lot line and then use some of the mean grade and record grade, that would be helpful and, I think, clarify some of the situation which results in a 5 21.66 height waiver for the tall building. Thank you. MR. JESSE GELLER: Thank you very much. 6 Anybody have questions? Mr. Schwartz? MR. SCHWARTZ: I think what we did there is we asked for the waiver and we said, in the alternative, 10 11 here's a calculation we believe is accurate where the 12 waiver wasn't required. But if the building inspector 13 disagrees with that, I think the waiver request is 14 there and so I don't think a new waiver list is 15 required for that specific purpose. MR. JESSE GELLER: Right. And at the end of 16 17 the day, it's a waiver request. 18 MS. NETTER: Since I don't have -- I mean, I could skim, but I don't want to skim and not think 19 20 about things, so I wanted to discuss quickly, in a 21 public forum, those issues that you feel you can 22 address through the plans just so that we can have 23 staff's response and the board understands what's 24 remaining.

1 So if it's okay, can we find out what they're 2. not going to present? MR. JESSE GELLER: MR. JOE GELLER: So there was a -- basically, 5 we did all of the changes that were requested between last Thursday and today. And there was one request 6 that we provide the location of the affordable units on 8 the plans, but that's not going to be decided until 9 later, so -- it would be decided with the subsidizing 10 agency, so that's not something that we can put on the 11 plans. 12 MS. NETTER: Can I ask a question? Because I 13 have been meaning to ask this all along. 14 Are you going to have separate affordable 15 units, or are these affordable units going to flow and you're just going to -- I don't know how you're doing 16 17 it. 18 And if the board members -- if I'm not being clear, I'm glad to --19 20 MR. SCHWARTZ: We'll do whatever the 21 subsidizing agency wants us to do. So if they -- I 22 think the preference would be to have floating units --23 by the developer -- but if they're going to require set 24 units, we'll do that. But that's their decision,

ultimately. 1 2 MR. JOE GELLER: There was a request that, if possible, could we not break Lot E2 across two sheets. And the problem is that the whole set was set up at a 5 scale, so if we start to try to put them on one sheet, 6 it just gets too small in scale, so we decided not to. MS. NETTER: Let me just get -- okay. MS. MORELLI: It's up to Dan. MS. NETTER: Mr. Bennett? MS. MORELLI: Lot E2 on two sheets? 10 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: I think it's two of them 12 that are on two sheets. 13 MR. BENNETT: It would just make for an easier 14 review when you're looking at one whole lot, but if 15 it's trouble for them to do that, if it would be too 16 small to read it, then we can work with what we have. 17 MR. JOE GELLER: There was a request that we 18 delineate the do-not-disturb zone, trees, and 19 outcropping to be preserved on the existing conditions 20 plan. The existing conditions plan is just that. the existing conditions plan. But we indicate a 21 22 limit-of-work line on the drawings, on a number of the 23 drawings, but specifically on the erosion and 24 sedimentation control plan. So that is the limit of

- 1 work. That's the limit of any exposure in those areas
- of trees and rock outcropping. Plus that plan also
- 3 shows all of the trees to be preserved, so we felt like
- 4 we've already accomplished that.
- 5 MS. NETTER: Let me check it out.
- MS. MORELLI: Dan, just one question about the
- 7 do not disturb, delineating those areas.
- 8 MR. BENNETT: In past dealings that I've had
- 9 with 40B, I've always -- when an applicant indicates
- 10 that they will preserve certain aspects of the site --
- 11 ledge, outcroppings, trees -- we would get a specific
- 12 plan that shows and identifies that and not mix it in
- 13 with any other specific plan. It just makes it easier
- 14 for us to delineate and see, going out on the site,
- where these areas are. And I think it would be clearer
- 16 for us to make that determination going on-site and
- 17 looking -- having the plan with us without having other
- layers or other issues on the plan.
- 19 MS. NETTER: Is that a problem? Is that
- 20 difficult to do, Mr. Geller?
- 21 MR. JOE GELLER: Of course we can do what you
- 22 want us to do.
- MS. NETTER: We're trying to really separate
- out the wheat from the chaff, so that would be

- 1 helpful.
- 2 MR. JOE GELLER: You requested separate
- 3 legends for the six-foot screen fence and the
- 4 seven-foot solid fence, the solid board fences.
- 5 We changed the legend to make it clearer, and
- 6 we also changed the detail to show the seven-foot fence
- 7 and the six-foot fence, the same detail. And it is
- 8 opaque -- it specifically says "opaque" now, so it's
- 9 clear that that's what it is. So I think that
- 10 addressed the issue. It was a little unclear what
- 11 exactly you were looking for, but I think that's what
- 12 you were looking for.
- 13 MS. MORELLI: Well, the six-foot fence looked
- 14 like it had a lattice on it.
- 15 MR. JOE GELLER: We took that off. It's all a
- 16 solid board fence.
- On the landscape plan, you asked that we
- 18 clarify in a chart that heights provided are that of
- 19 new trees when first planted. We indicated on the
- 20 chart -- what's typically included for standard nursery
- 21 stock delineation of trees is not by height for
- deciduous trees. It's by caliber size. And so that's
- 23 what we put in there. It is height on the evergreen
- 24 trees. But I don't know any other way to do that

because that's how the nurseries sell trees and that's 1 2 how you identify the trees. MS. NETTER: You okay? MS. MORELLI: That's up to Dan. 5 MR. BENNETT: I guess I would just like one clarification. In some of the elevations that you've 6 shown when you're walking down some of the streets and looking through the properties with trees, without trees, they showed a number of those plantings and I didn't know if those plantings were -- or the proposed 10 11 landscaping was at the time of planting, that was the 12 height that they would be, or if it's in five years or 13 ten years. And that was the reason for that 14 specificity. 1.5 MR. JOE GELLER: The renderings don't show the 16 exact planting. That's the point of a planting plan. 17 It shows the size and scale of the plans on the 18 planting plans. So --19 MS. NETTER: So the renderings are showing 20 like five years out, or do you have some ideas of --21 MR. JOE GELLER: They're fairly close to the 22 sizes, depending on the trees, but it's kind of hard to 23 say just generically. I would say five years out is

probably the longest out that it would be.

24

1 MS. NETTER: Is that what you need, 2. Mr. Bennett? MR. BENNETT: That's fine for me. It's just a matter of what the board -- when making their 5 determination of that screening, if that's sufficient or if they want to indicate a more mature tree down the 6 That's all. road. MR. JOE GELLER: The sizes I've shown on the planting plan is what the size will be when planted, so 9 10 it's pretty clear to show -- if you're looking at what 11 the screening is, you can look at that and it tells you 12 what it is because all those evergreens are sized by 13 height. 14 MS. NETTER: Is that acceptable? 1.5 MR. HUSSEY: I think so. So the height that's 16 indicated on the plan -- what the height will be in 17 five years, then? 18 MR. JOE GELLER: On the planting plan, the 19 height is what it will be when planted. 20 MR. HUSSEY: Okay, thanks. 21 MS. NETTER: For the evergreens. 22 MR. JOE GELLER: For the evergreens, right. 23 There were a number of comments about 24 lighting. This is the first time we heard about the

- 1 town's interpretation of the light poles as a structure
- 2 and that it would be subject to the height limitations
- of the bylaw. We've shown a 16-foot light pole, and I
- 4 guess anything in that area would be -- 15 foot would
- 5 be the maximum height per the zoning. So if you want
- 6 to put a condition in there for 15 feet, we'd be fine
- 7 with that but we didn't change all those poles on the
- 8 drawings because we just weren't sure if that was
- 9 important enough.
- 10 MS. NETTER: Let me just double check. I
- 11 don't know who requested that.
- 12 MR. BENNETT: That was me. That's fine, as
- 13 long as they understand that 15 feet is typically the
- max that we allow.
- 15 MS. NETTER: Without getting a waiver.
- MR. BENNETT: Correct, yes.
- 17 MR. JOE GELLER: And there was one light pole
- 18 that was in a front yard setback, and we moved that
- 19 pole back.
- 20 Other than that, I think we did everything
- 21 that was indicated.
- MS. NETTER: Okay. Thank you.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: Thank you.
- 24 Anybody have questions at this point? I

```
assume not.
 1
 2
               (No audible response.)
               MR. JESSE GELLER: What I'd like to do now is
      I'd like to offer an opportunity for members of the
 5
      public to come up, as we've done in the past, and offer
      their comments. Tonights comments are limited to the
 6
      proposed conditions or suggested conditions should this
      application be approved.
               Just generally, by a show of hands, how many
10
      people have comments?
11
               Okay. Great. As Edie reminds me, I do want
12
      to mention that we have had a number of letters
13
      offering proposed conditions, comments on conditions,
14
      and I want to thank those who have submitted them.
1.5
               I also want to note that we will -- you would
16
      be encouraged and you certainly can continue to submit
17
      your comments up until January 5th. So should you have
      any further comments, again, that relate to conditions,
18
19
      we can certainly welcome them -- written comments.
20
               MR. HUSSEY: Can we amend that a little bit?
21
      I mean, we got a whole slew of stuff today, including
22
      some that I haven't even read, evidently. It came in
23
      after 5:00. Can we have a deadline a little bit
24
      earlier on getting these written comments because that
```

- 1 next meeting is supposed to be the end meeting, so
- 2 we're supposed to be fully prepared. We need to get
- 3 this stuff in a timely manner. I know it has to go
- 4 through the Planning Department, so there may be a
- 5 delay there.
- 6 MR. JESSE GELLER: Right.
- 7 MR. HUSSEY: If we could set a deadline --
- 8 MR. JESSE GELLER: Do you want to set it for
- 9 Friday at --
- 10 MR. HUSSEY: Let's see. The Thursday is
- 11 New Year's Day.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: Are you doing something for
- 13 New Year's?
- 14 MR. HUSSEY: No, as a matter of fact. But
- nevertheless, I would say the 4th. I would say the
- 16 Wednesday, the day before New Year's, to get them in
- 17 time.
- 18 MR. JESSE GELLER: I'm okay with that. Are
- 19 you okay with that?
- MR. BOOK: I agree.
- MR. ZUROFF: Yes.
- 22 MR. HUSSEY: That works out for the Planning
- 23 Department.
- MS. STEINFELD: We're happy to do what the

- 1 board requests, but if the public hearing is open to
- 2 the 5th and we still continue to get comments, we'll
- 3 still relay them.
- 4 MS. NETTER: You can accept them, but I think
- 5 what the board is saying is that for you to have your
- 6 comments fully and carefully considered, and if the
- 7 board members have questions, they need to be able to
- 8 have read them to ask you questions before the hearing
- 9 is closed.
- 10 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay? So if your concern
- is that we will have a full opportunity to review what
- it is you submit, please submit them by next Wednesday
- 13 at 5:00 p.m. Thank you.
- Why don't people line up.
- 15 MS. STEINFELD: 5:00 New Year's Eve. Thank
- 16 you.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: We'll be around.
- MS. STEINFELD: Of course.
- 19 MR. PU: I'm Bill Pu. I'm at 249 Beverly
- 20 Road. I'm an abutter and a Town Meeting member. I
- 21 apologize for having been one of the people to have
- 22 submitted my comments at the last minute, and I hope
- 23 that you all later have time to review them more
- 24 fully. I'll just try to go through the highlights.

First, Steve -- this letter was written by 1 Steve Chiumenti and I. We wanted to first indicate 2 that we felt that this project should be denied, as we said all along. We wanted to point out that after a 5 year of going back and forth about this plan, that the amount that the plan has decreased is really quite 6 small, 11.8 percent in square feet, 16 percent in units, 20 percent in bedrooms, 6.3 percent in parking. I think that's really a quite modest reduction for what could have been done. 10 11 Almost all of the town boards and other stakeholders in Brookline decried this proposal. 12 13 asked that it go through a pro forma review so that we 14 would have a minimal sized project, but the ZBA did not 1.5 see fit to do that. 16 The conceptual site design does not differ 17 substantially from the one that MassDevelopment 18 outright rejected in 2011, which, as you know, is a 19 quite rare occurrence. 20 So seeing that the board has decided instead 21 to approve the project with conditions, we feel that a 22 far better project still could have been produced under 23 40B and that this current project does not reflect the 24 best interest of the town, nor does it best serve the

local need for affordable housing. 1 2 So now we get to the specific conditions, which is what I really want to spend the time on. have a number of concerns about the conditions and the 5 details of the conditions that we think may benefit the decision. 6 So the first is that the board knows that there's a lawsuit going on between the town with several abutters as co-plaintiffs, including myself and MassDevelopment and Chestnut Hill Realty. Now, we 10 11 don't really want the board to have to weigh in on 12 that, but we feel that the board should make the 13 conditions -- the go-ahead with the project contingent 14 upon this lawsuit being settled with finality. 15 does not require any opinion of the board of whether 16 there's validity or not to the lawsuit, simply that it 17 should be allowed to reach finality in the courts 18 before the project goes ahead. 19 The second point is about VFW Parkway access. 20 Now, the draft decision, point number 22, asks that 21 Chestnut Hill Realty try to get access to VFW Parkway, 22 but there's nothing that happens if no access is 23 obtained other than they lose 10 parking spots -- or 24 they don't gain 10 parking spots.

1 Now, one of the most pressing problems of this 2. proposal is the large apartment building and the increase of traffic on the local roads, particularly Russett Road. And this board discussed this quite a 5 bit, so I think you recognize that problem or potential problem. But the solution was a reduction of parking 6 by 6.3 percent. I don't think that really counts as sufficient mitigation. It's fully within this board's power to require that VFW access be a condition for proceeding 10 11 with development. Now, this board discussed that 12 briefly and said that it was unfair. Now, where did 13 this subjective standard come from, and why is it 14 unfair? I know of many instances of this -- in this --15 well, to me that seem unfair, so I don't see why this decision should be based on what's fair or not fair. 16 17 Or at least that needs to be defined more carefully. 18 It's the state's mandated need for local affordable housing that's driving this project. If the 19 20 state really wants it, wouldn't they grant VFW Parkway 21 access? I think that that decision should be left up 22 to the state. If they really want it, then open up 23 Why should the local neighborhood pay for that, I 24 guess, two-facedness of the state?

A third point, I think has been addressed, is 1 2 that we did not have any of the final dimensional plans, and I hope that the latest plans are made available. As abutters, we would like to know just how 5 close this parking is going to get, which trees are going to be cut down, where will the blasting occur. I 6 think that these things all need to be provided to the 8 public so that we could make some intelligent comments about them, and I see that hopefully that has been remedied now. 10 11 I was concerned by a lack of specifics in the draft decision, and I'll just list a few examples, but 12 13 this is not a comprehensive list. 14 So point number 9 says that all leases for 15 units in the project shall include language stating 16 that tenants may not use any rooms other than bedrooms 17 for sleeping purposes. Living rooms or dining rooms 18 may not be used as bedrooms. 19 First of all, I think lofts should be included 20 in there; secondly, there's no consequences specified, 21 so this is a toothless condition; third, this condition is impossible to enforce, and so it's also toothless. 22 23 So I understand the purpose of the condition, but I 24 would hope that something better could be put in place

with specifics, with penalties, and with enforcement 1 2 procedures. I don't know the law, but I wonder if it can be specified if a maximum number of unrelated individuals that can cohabit a unit can be specified based on the number of bedrooms. Can the number of 5 people per bedroom be specified? 6 I had some comments in my written comments about open space and landscaping but I will just, for the sake of time, not go into those. Regarding traffic, number 21, transportation 10 access plan, .4, expanding existing shuttle service, 11 12 the decision asks for more shuttle service, but it does 13 not indicate by how much. How will the adequacy of 14 shuttle service be measured? How often will it be 15 measured? What will be the penalty for not providing 16 adequate shuttle service? 17 So the same section, .6, charging a fee for 18 each parking space. I'm quessing you are asking for a fee per parking space to make it a disincentive to have 19 20 a car, which I applaud that. But if that's your goal, 21 then you need to specify the fee. What's the minimum 22 fee? How will the fee -- the levy of the fee -- be 23 enforced? What's the penalty for not levying the fee? 24 The fee could be used to support expanded shuttle

service. Maybe it should be restricted to the use for 1 2 shuttle service. Stormwater, number 33. The applicant shall take water quality samples. When will they take them? 5 How often? Will the results be public? Who will pay for mitigation if the water quality is inadequate? 6 Infrastructure, number 37. Here the board says that basically the town is not responsible for the infrastructure of the project, basically absolving the town of any -- washing the hands of the town of any 10 11 responsibility. 12 We've indicated a lot of skepticism about the 13 stormwater management plan. The stormwater management 14 plan requires ongoing maintenance. Its function is to 1.5 prevent excessive runoff into abutting properties and the Hoar Sanctuary. The developer, therefore, has an 16 17 obligation to maintain that system. But if it doesn't, then it's everyone holding the bag. Therefore, the 18 town must play a role in enforcement and monitoring to 19 20 make sure that the system performs adequately and that 21 maintenance is performed, and this had to occur in 22 perpetuity. The town can't wash its hands of this 23 after it places the burden on the neighborhood. 24 Another public health issue is trash. Now,

we've shown the board the pictures of the trash at 1 2 Hancock Village and trash -- it may not sound like it's important, but it's a chronic issue. There's always trash overflowing the trash bins. There have been 5 public health citations about the trash, but the trash is still there, so the board should stipulate the trash 6 pickup, how it would be handled. And there should be 8 penalties for failure to adequately deal with trash. It should be punitive, and it should escalate with 10 repeated infractions. 11 Traffic: One point is, I think the 12 transportation board was left out of all the traffic 13 decisions, so I think the transportation board should 14 be included in decisions that affect public ways. 1.5 We felt that the left turn from the driveways 16 onto Independence Drive should not be allowed. That's 17 dangerous for both pedestrians and motorists, so the 18 board could consider either totally blocking left turns or perhaps during peak traffic hours preventing left 19 20 turns. 21 Back to the stormwater. So as I mentioned, 22 the stormwater management plan was, in our minds, 23 highly controversial and we're skeptical it's going to 24 work. Now, the board, I think, was very good in asking

for postconstruction assessment of traffic, so what I 1 2 would request is a pre- and postconstruction analysis of stormwater drainage. And if the system does not function according to specifications, then there should 5 be penalties and corrective action should be mandated. This study should be done by an independent consultant 6 hired by the town and granted full access to the development now and after construction. Furthermore, the stormwater management plan, as I mentioned, requires maintenance, so we need to 10 11 have a plan in place to monitor maintenance to make 12 sure it's adequate. The plan should include ongoing measurements of stormwater runoff to make sure the 13 14 system is performing as it should. There should be 15 specifics about the penalties that will occur if the system does not work. This should occur in perpetuity. 16 17 Historic preservation is another point. Hancock Village is acknowledged as a valuable historic 18 resource. This was not listed in the findings, 19 20 although it should be considered in the balancing. 21 Point number 36 about historic preservation 22 simply says that any correspondence with Mass 23 Historical Commission needs to be copied to Brookline. 24 That, essentially, has no impact. This condition needs

to be strengthened. It should say something like no 1 site work or construction may commence, no building permits may be issued unless and until the applicant provides evidence of all necessary filings and 5 approvals with MEPA and MHC. These filings include a project notification form with MHC as required by 6 applicable law and with MEPA as so required. I hope the ZBA will consider these recommendations, and I do hope that you might reconsider your overall decision. Thank you. 10 11 MR. JESSE GELLER: Thank you. 12 MR. CHIUMENTI: I'm Steve Chiumenti, 13 Precinct 16 and Town Meeting member. I just want to 14 add maybe two minutes to this and, of course, these 15 comments are in writing. 16 And I think unless you condition this on the 17 resolution of the lawsuit that's pending and so on, 18 there could be confusion about when permits need to be 19 issued and there could be arguments about that and 20 confusion about when building can begin and so on 21 because things don't automatically necessarily stop. 22 That would make it clear that nothing is to happen 23 until everything's resolved including the lawsuit 24 itself.

1 We earlier submitted a thorough analysis, 2. really as prescribed by the Housing Appeals Committee. The Housing Appeals Committee's regulations set out in detail that a Zoning Board of Appeals is supposed to 5 follow the same line-by-line items that the Housing Appeals Committee follows when it reviews a decision of 6 the Zoning Board, and we went basically line by line with safety and the site planning and the green space and so on and I don't see a lot of evidence of that in the conditions. And I really would recommend that you 10 11 look at that because the Housing Appeals Committee specifies in the regulations what the Zoning Board is 12 13 supposed to do. 14 Of course, we maintain that this project 15 should be denied or very strenuously conditioned, as we've discussed over the previous months, and I've been 16 17 struck by what I can only characterize as what seems to be timidity in applying conditions on this project. 18 And the Zoning Board has extraordinary discretion and 19 20 power in limiting this project and placing conditions 21 on it. 22 And I just wanted to mention the Groton case, 23 a case I've come across in reading all of these cases, 24 because -- and citing for other reasons usually -- but

the Groton case involved an undeveloped parcel in 1 2 Groton that abutted a major road in Groton. It was surrounded -- not only was it undeveloped, it was surrounded by actual property that was undeveloped. 5 belonged to the town. The developer proposed to build 44 apartments and about 13 buildings and they were 6 going to be scattered along an 800-foot roadway, driveway, whatever you want to call it. It sounded a little familiar when I was reading it, frankly. 10 Fundamentally, the Zoning Board objected. 11 problems were safety and traffic related. They didn't 12 like that there was this long, 800-foot road. 13 the only way in, the only way out, and you merged onto 14 the roadway and so on with limited visibility. 15 basically had safety concerns about traffic, about 16 access of emergency vehicles. They denied the project 17 outright. 18 And what's interesting about this case -there's other things I'll mention in a second -- but 19 20 what's interesting about this case is that they denied 21 it outright and they were upheld in the denial. They didn't have flooding problems. They didn't have 22 23 building height problems. They didn't have half the 24 problems that we have in this case. It was just an

800-foot road, one way in, one way out. Basically, it 1 2 was not surrounded by tight neighborhoods or that sort of thing. In fact, along the roadway is a 10-foot strip of property that belonged to the town and was 5 undeveloped. The Supreme Judicial Court upheld the denial. 6 The reason it got -- and basically that was one of the two holdings. And the significant thing here is that that was all that was involved in that project. It was denied, and the Supreme Judicial Court upheld it for 10 11 safety concerns. 12 The reason this case is usually discussed is 13 not because of that. That isn't particularly 14 interesting for most other people. It seems to me like 15 it was a simple case for us. Seems like a much easier 16 case to approve rather than to be denied. 17 The thing is that this 10-foot strip of 18 property that belonged to the town was one of the 19 important causes for their concern about safety. It 20 basically had -- not outcroppings, not buildings, 21 not -- grass. The grass was tall. And basically it 22 got to the Supreme Judicial Court because the Housing 23 Appeals Court decided that, well, they could basically 24 give the developer authority to go on the town's

Page 33

property and mow the grass. 1 2 Well, of course, if someone's telling you you can go on someone else's property and do something, they're giving you an easement. And the Housing 5 Appeals Committee doesn't have any business or authority to grant easements. That's why it got up to 6 the Supreme Judicial Court. It took the Supreme Judicial Court to explain to the Housing Appeals Committee it didn't have the authority to grant 10 easements. 11 But fundamentally, what was basic -basically, this case was that the Supreme Judicial 12 13 Court upheld the denial and that basically their 14 finding that this was -- their safety concerns were 15 sufficient to deny the project, and that's why I wanted to mention that case. And I'll give you the case. 16 17 printed it out. 18 But otherwise, as I said, I recommend the two things in writing that have already been submitted, 19 20 particularly the regulation-by-regulation review of 21 this project. Thank you. 22 MR. JESSE GELLER: Thank you. 23 My name is Abby Cox. MS. COX: I'm a Town 24 Meeting member of Precinct 8, and I'm also a member of

the school committee. And I'm speaking on behalf of a 1 2 very concerned school committee about how the proposed Hancock Village 40B project is likely to affect the long-term capital expansion plan for the public schools of Brookline. 5 The public schools of Brookline embraces our 6 mission of providing a high quality education for all of our students no matter where in the town they live or how long they've lived there. A large number of new 10 students coming into a very densely populated school 11 system would be a formidable challenge. 12 As we've discussed with the ZBA in the past, 13 the Brookline elementary population has grown since 14 2005 by over 1,500 students, or 40 percent. Since 2007 1.5 when the first enrollment projection suggested a much 16 smaller growth pattern, we have followed consultants' 17 advice to either build a 9th K to 8 school or, barring the ability to do that, move expeditiously to expand 18 all of our elementary schools. 19 20 Through repurposing space in some buildings 21 and moving pre-K classrooms into rental spaces and the 22 renovations of the Runkle and Heath Schools, we 23 successfully added 50 class sections in the elementary 24 schools. We're currently building an addition at the

Lawrence School with four new classrooms, and Devotion 1 2 School will be renovated and expanded in the next several years to accommodate over 1,000 students. Even with these efforts, we face immediate 5 overcrowding and insufficient space for our anticipated enrollments at the Baker School next fall and at the 6 Pierce School the following year. Expenditures for rental spaces for portable classrooms and for enrollment accommodations are increasing annually. We're also working with consultants to see if a site 10 11 can be found or purchased for a ninth elementary school 12 or for other expansions. Another consultant is helping 13 us anticipate an expansion for Brookline High School. 14 More on that in a minute. 1.5 In order to finance this necessary expansion 16 of our school's facilities, the Town of Brookline will 17 likely face a vote on the capital debt exclusion next 18 May to finance the renovation and expansion project at the Devotion School and to provide some funding so that 19 20 we can move expeditiously on the planning for the 21 projects described before. Other projects, such as 22 those I just mentioned for the high school or a 23 potential ninth elementary school will likely require 24 additional requests to the tax payers.

1 What I want to emphasize tonight is that none 2. of the growth or the plans I've just described incorporate enrollment growth from the 40B project now contemplated at Hancock Village. The proposed 5 development falls squarely within the Baker School's attendance district, but its impact will be felt across 6 the town. Baker now serves 824 students, approximately one-third of whom come from Hancock Village. 10 already well in excess of its built capacity at 679 11 students. At 127 square feet of building space per 12 student, Baker is one of the two most crowded K to 8 13 schools in the system. We're already looking at 14 options for Baker next year that include bringing in 1.5 portable classrooms or even sending some kindergartners to a different site. 16 17 As proposed, the new family-sized units at 18 Hancock Village alone could add as many as 200 more 19 students to Baker. In practice, a far higher number is 20 likely, as one-bedroom apartments and even some studios 21 or lofts sometimes house families with children. 22 appreciate that this is reflected in the conditions set 23 forth in the ZBA's draft decision. You suggest that 24 language be included in the rental agreements that only

true bedrooms be used for sleeping purposes, but we 1 2 wonder how and if this will be enforced. I think Mr. Pu addressed some of our concerns as some kind of ideas of how those conditions might be tightened. 5 This proposed development will, in short, simply overwhelm Baker and our schools in South 6 Brookline, requiring shifting of students to Lincoln, Health, and Runkle Schools, none of which have extra capacity. 10 Of equal concern is the potential impact of 11 these additional students on the future of Brookline 12 High School. Our long-term space plan anticipates the 13 same 40 percent growth and enrollment at BHS as the 14 larger grades at the elementary schools matriculate 15 upward. With our current enrollment, we know that BHS will grow from today's 1,800 students to a school with 16 17 at least 2,600 by 2024. 18 As with the elementary school planning, we have been considering different solutions for the high 19 20 school for some years. In the last two years, we've 21 engaged two architectural firms to present us with some 22 concepts for how the BHS site could be expanded. Their 23 analyses suggest that the BHS campus could be rebuilt 24 to handle 2,600 students, but those consultants have

warned that any more than that may be impossible to 1 2 absorb at BHS's single location. Should this Hancock Village development go forward as currently planned, our estimate of 2,600 will almost certainly be too low. 5 That will fundamentally change the conversation about how Brookline can or would respond. 6 Any of the options that would have to be 8 considered for an addition to Baker, a new school, or even larger BHS come with significant costs to the town 10 and the taxpayers. What is the financial impact to the 11 schools? An additional 200 to 250 students -- and, 12 again, that may be a low estimate -- at an average cost 13 of \$16,000 per pupil -- which is the figure that was 14 used in the Override Study Committee's work -- would 1.5 mean an additional \$3.2- to \$4 million in operating 16 costs. Clearly, the cost of this enrollment-driven 17 expansion would far outstrip any new revenues generated from the 40B project's residential property. 18 19 More important, however, it would force 20 dramatic changes in the configuration of and local 21 access to our public schools; changes that will touch 22 families across the public schools, not just those in 23 the Baker district, as well as the neighborhoods in 24 which they reside.

On behalf of the Brookline School Committee, 1 our students, and our community, I urge you to consider 2 the impact on the school system before allowing this proposal to move forward. 5 MS. WONG: Good evening. My name is Joyce Wong. I'm a resident of Brookline. I've been a 6 resident for 17 years, and I'm also a parent of two children, one at the high school and one at Baker School. 10 So actually, I have several points to make and, actually, one question I'd like to actually pose 11 12 to the board is -- what I have yet to hear is, what is 13 actually the benefit of such a project? It's obvious 14 that Chestnut Hill Realty has a great deal to benefit, 15 but in terms of the town as a whole, I'd like to hear 16 from you what you see as the benefit. 17 Because as we just heard from -- and I 18 completely agree with what's been said so far -- is 19 there's a lot of kind of negative impact in terms of 20 the schools and things, so I was wondering if -- in 21 terms of the decision-making process, I'm wondering if 22 I can hear -- and, I mean, because when I look on the 23 Internet and everything, there's nothing about anything 24 positive. Obviously, like I said, they clearly have a

lot of financial benefits, but I'd like to hear, what 1 2 does the town have to benefit from this project? (Brief pause.) Well, okay. If you don't want to answer the 5 question, that's fine. But all I'm saying, somebody needs to raise this question because it seems really 6 unfair, I think, to have -- for the entire town -- if we're talking about overrides and things, to really increase our taxes and everything and then to have one institution, the CHR, benefit. 10 11 And then the other thing you're talking about, 40B, we have to remember that when the owner purchased 12 13 this he converted everything that was affordable 14 housing to market value. So really what the point --15 really what you should consider is, why don't they convert some of those back to affordable housing? And 16 17 the point is, as it's been done in the past, what's to 18 stop them in the future from converting back to market 19 value? 20 I mean, those are the points I'd like to make 21 and also kind of a final thing, because I think this 22 is -- requires vision from the entire town. I think 23 that you really have the power to make a decision here 24 that really can impact negatively on the entire town.

Right? 1 2 I mean, so I think -- I understand how you make decisions that are separate from the school because I have had discussions with Superintendent 5 Lupini and it's beyond my -- I don't quite understand how this could happen, but I know that decisions that 6 are made for the school are separate from development. But thinking from a holistic -- especially in the financial times that we are now, it just simply isn't financially responsible to make these kinds of 10 11 decisions where we're going to have to either make a 12 new elementary school or a new high school. I think it 13 just has so much negative impact on the entire rest of 14 the town when you just have only one institution here 1.5 that's benefiting from this. 16 And so just like how you have escrow --17 because I did read the draft. I read it today and I 18 actually sent this email earlier this morning. I think how they put into escrow -- really modest amount, I 19 20 think it was, in terms of looking at parking -- they 21 should do similar things for schools. Right? terms of, like, either they contribute somehow -- I 22 23 mean, I know they're contributing to the circle in 24 front of Baker. I mean, that's nice and all, but

that's really not going to fix our problems. 1 2 I'd like to see more kind of faith and commitment. Right? If they're really committed to the town, that they really should be playing some role in terms of 5 community and actually helping with the problem. know, I think that --6 MR. JESSE GELLER: Ms. Wong, we're here 8 tonight to discuss conditions. I would strongly urge you -- these hearings have gone on for a year, and 10 there has been a significant amount of testimony that's 11 been offered. And I'm happy to hear what you have to 12 say. I know you submitted some of this in written 13 fashion, which is excellent. But I think many of these 14 questions that you are asking are answered within 15 testimony that we heard over a long, long period of 16 time. So my intention is not to cut you off, but --17 MS. WONG: I appreciate that, because I know 18 you're supposed to focus on conditions. All I -- just 19 one last thing. I would just also say, I think it's 20 important, too -- just from a due diligence, I think 21 it's important to understand who stands to benefit from 22 this and just to make sure that all the kind of 23 conflict of interest is kind of done. That's all I 24 would ask. But thank you for clarifying, and thank you

```
for letting me speak.
 1
 2
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Thank you.
               MR. WISHINSKY: Neil Wishinsky. I'm on the
      Board of Selectmen, though I'm speaking for myself.
 5
      don't have anything profound to say that hasn't been
      said, so I'll just offer some probably relatively minor
 6
      comments on the conditions.
               So in number 8 of the procedural history, you
      state that all the boards and commissions were
      notified. But then there's no recognition anywhere in
10
11
      the draft decision that all of the boards and
12
      commissions that so offered opinions, including the
13
      Board of Selectmen, Planning, Conservation, Schools,
14
      Preservation, all had negative comments about the
15
      project, as did all -- I can't recall any positive
16
      testimony from any citizen. And I think that's an
17
      important thing to put in the findings. It's just a
      statement of fact as to the nature of the proceedings.
18
19
               I would also suggest that number 10 -- finding
20
      number 10 is entirely appropriate and that you should
21
      resist any pressure to remove number 10 which states
22
      that conceptual project design is not generally
23
      appropriate for the site. And I think that's an
24
      important finding.
```

```
In condition number 5 -- I think the intent of
 1
 2
      condition number 5 -- and that has to do with the
      parking on the 40B part of the site -- be limited to
      the 40B tenets. To me, the language is a little
 5
      unclear, and maybe you can try sharpening the language
      a little bit. I would also suggest that there be
 6
      provisions for town verification of that being
      followed. And I don't know if it's appropriate for
      penalties for not being followed in here, but if it is,
10
      I would suggest you put that in there. That's pretty
11
      much all I have to say.
12
               MR. JESSE GELLER:
                                  Thank you.
               MS. LEICHTNER: My name is Judith Leichtner.
13
14
      I'm a Town Meeting member from Precinct 16. And I did
1.5
      put this in writing, but I did want to mention this.
16
               As this long hearing comes to a close, I'd
17
      like to add a comment about this process. While I
18
      appreciate the many hours that have been spent, I'm
      also disappointed, as I feel that not everything was
19
20
      done that was allowed under the 40B process to do
21
      what's in the best interest for Brookline.
22
               Having attended every ZBA meeting, I do
23
      realize there are many constraints the 40B law places
24
      on this board. But at the very first meeting of this
```

group last January, lawyers Kathy Murphy and Sam Nagler 1 2 described the process to you as the ZBA as well as to the citizens in attendance, and at that time they discussed the idea of conditions being placed on the 5 project and that the applicant could claim that the conditions were uneconomic. 6 Mr. Liss then asked what I thought was a very good question. "Doesn't the applicant always say the conditions are uneconomic?" Ms. Murphy replied that then the developer 10 11 bears the burden of proof to show that the conditions render the project uneconomic. 12 13 What's disappointing to me, the neighbors, the 14 many people from all over town who wrote to you, as 1.5 well as the selectmen that commented on this issue is 16 that this developer did say many times during the 17 hearing that the suggested conditions about less 18 parking, fewer and smaller units, or the conditions of 19 Mr. Hussey -- the only member of the board with design 20 experience -- to remove an entire floor and an entire 21 level of parking would be uneconomic, but the board 22 never asked the developer to prove that. 23 Even if one accepts Ms. Netter's statement on 24 November 3rd that 40B is about getting the least worst

project, in this case, how can we know that, since the 1 2 developer never had to prove that a significantly smaller project would be uneconomic, a project with less parking, less destruction of green space, less 5 blasting, less impact on the small roads surrounding the area, and most importantly, less negative long-term 6 impact on the entire town? We will never know if this is the least worst project. Thank you. MR. JESSE GELLER: Thank you. MR. POLLARD: My name is Ruben Pollard. I 10 11 live at 243 Beverly Road, which abuts this project, and I would just like to make one last appeal to the Zoning 12 13 Board of Appeals to protect the integrity of our 14 neighborhood. 1.5 Our neighborhood was set up as a residential 16 neighborhood in Brookline with backyards -- abutting 17 backyards. They provide space between buildings and privacy between houses. And for this reason, when the 18 backyards of Beverly Road abutted the golf course that 19 20 preceded the development of Hancock Village, that 21 wasn't an issue. But when Hancock Village was 22 developed, they created a buffer space to protect the distance to our backyards. And that distance isn't 23 24 great. I mean, the buildings that are behind our house

are a comfortable distance away, but no more distant 1 2 than another house if that was developed as a residential neighborhood with backyards abutting. So then Ed Zucker and his crew come and say, 5 well, we're going to turn houses sideways and those are going to be side yards and we can put those right up 6 against your fence, and all the machinations that have been listened to and have influenced this project. Now it has buildings right up against the property line, which just becomes our -- they're taking our space. 10 11 They're taking our privacy because they can. 12 When the -- I'm sure -- the Zoning Board of 13 Appeals agreed to allow houses to be built within four 14 feet, ten feet of the Hoar Sanctuary on the Rangeley 15 Road, they didn't consider that that was taking away 16 from the privacy of the sanctuary by moving 17 6,000-square-foot houses to right up against the 18 sanctuary property. But it did. That ceded the 19 privacy of the sanctuary over to these homeowners on 20 Rangeley Road, and I don't want to see the same thing 21 happen on Beverly Road. I don't want to see houses 22 built up against our property lines. And so consider 23 our privacy and protect our neighborhood. Thank vou. 24 MR. JESSE GELLER: Thank you.

```
Anybody else?
 1
 2
               (No audible response.)
               MR. JESSE GELLER: What I'd like to do now
      is -- we have all received a draft of the decisions.
 5
      And in order to start the process of reviewing the
      content of that draft, we need to start going through
 6
      the various items and run through comments, questions,
      thoughts, changes. It's clearly going to be a lengthy
      process, but I don't have a better way of doing this,
10
      so I think we're simply going to have to do it on a
11
      page-by-page basis. I'm pleased to see that you've
12
      marked up your various versions. I saw notes.
13
               MR. HUSSEY: Well, they were different. I'll
14
      mention -- when you get down, I'll --
1.5
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. So what I would ask
16
      is that people turn to the condition section, and we'll
17
      just start to run through those.
18
               Mr Hussey, do you have something you want
19
      t.o --
20
               MR. HUSSEY: Well, only that I wanted to
      mention to our consultants that I hope -- we received a
21
22
      number of letters in the past week which have
23
      recommendations, and I would hope that in the review
24
      and amendments to the conditions you would take those
```

Page 49

requests into consideration. 1 This is only the beginning of a 2 MS. NETTER: process. And we can take those into consideration, but 3 I hope you will also because now is the time for you to 5 give us your direction. So I certainly will do that, but more importantly, you let us know which of those 6 comments or how those comments affect your thinking. 8 Not right now necessarily, but -- yeah. Because we --MR. HUSSEY: Oh, it's the neighborhood 10 comments. 11 MS. NETTER: Yes. Oh, absolutely, anything you choose. I mean, this, as we said before, is 12 13 largely a compilation of all the evidence that's been 14 submitted to date, but now we move it forward. MR. HUSSEY: Okay. 1.5 16 MR. JESSE GELLER: It's essentially a 17 reduction of -- every time, over the course of this 18 matter, in which people have -- whether it be peer reviewers, whether it be suggestions from the 19 20 neighborhood or from our consultants of conditions, 21 it's basically a list and it's been reduced into a 22 written decision format. 23 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Well, I have it marked up, 24 but I'd like to review them further myself before I

- 1 pass these on to the consultants.
- MS. NETTER: Well, what I'm hoping to have
- 3 happen -- and I heard what you're saying -- but at some
- 4 point we need to have a discussion amongst the three of
- 5 you with all of your comments together because what I
- 6 just --
- 7 MR. JESSE GELLER: Four.
- 8 MS. NETTER: Four of you, excuse me. Maybe I
- 9 was skipping you, Mr. Geller.
- 10 MR. JESSE GELLER: I should be so lucky.
- 11 MS. NETTER: But I would like to have all of
- 12 you, you know, as opposed to us looking at your written
- 13 comments, because where you may disagree amongst
- 14 yourselves, that's a conversation for you to have.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Schwartz, you're
- 16 standing up.
- 17 MR. SCHWARTZ: Yeah. I just -- I want to -- I
- 18 was not -- I don't think we were aware that there would
- 19 be a discussion of conditions this evening, which is
- 20 fine. As the board may know, we submitted detailed
- 21 comments on the conditions, and I suspect, because of
- 22 the time, that you haven't had a chance to incorporate
- 23 those. And I just want to make sure that those are
- 24 taken into account.

```
1
               And my only thought or concern or whatever is
 2.
      that if you have that discussion without having an
      opportunity to properly consider those, respectfully, I
      don't think that's a fully -- and discuss it with your
 5
      counsel -- respectfully, I don't think that's the best
      way to go about it. So, you know, it's your hearing
 6
      and it's your call, but I would just ask you to
      consider that.
               MS. NETTER: Our thinking, Mr. Schwartz and
      members of the public, is this draft has been done
10
11
      without input from the board, other than their input
12
      over the last year. And so the thought is that we
13
      would just like to have a preliminary -- begin a
14
      preliminary discussion with them and they will take
15
      into account your thoughts and the additional letters
      that have been given. But this is just trying to get
16
17
      an idea of what their thinking is.
18
               MR. HUSSEY: We have not received yet the
19
      letter --
20
               MS. NETTER:
                            No.
21
               MR. JESSE GELLER: It came this evening.
22
               MR. HUSSEY:
                            Oh.
23
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Was it circulated to
24
      everybody, or --
```

MS. STEINFELD: I don't know. We got a 609 on 1 2 our phones. MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. So I'm sure that will get circulated this evening or tomorrow. 5 MR. SCHWARTZ: Again, we were not aware of the fact that there would be a discussion of conditions. 6 We did our best to get it to you as soon as possible. 8 As the board knows -- and I think, you know, your counsel and advisors will tell you -- the discussions 10 of the conditions can take place either during the 11 public hearing or after the public hearing as the board 12 chooses. I'm just concerned that there not be, you 13 know, a prejudicial effect, frankly, as a result of 14 your discussion here this evening, because you are 1.5 making several points in broad categories as to these 16 conditions. And I think, totally understandably, you 17 have not yet had an opportunity to consider those. 18 MR. JESSE GELLER: Do you have any further thoughts on that? 19 20 MS. NETTER: I don't want to kind of take 21 over, but I'm trying to get your thoughts on general 22 planning issues, you know, if we're kind of in the 23 right direction or the wrong direction on some issues. 24 I mean, certainly you can defer, but I think it would

be a productive -- could be a productive conversation. 1 2 But your thoughts? MR. BOOK: I just -- I'm wondering -- you know, we haven't seen the applicant's comments. I 5 haven't had an opportunity to review many of the neighborhood's comments. Anything that came in today, 6 I just did not have an opportunity to look at. And I think a lot of the -- some of those comments are going to have an affect of formulating the conditions and my 10 comments on the conditions that have been presented in 11 this draft. And so I don't know. I have a little bit 12 of a concern about -- maybe this is premature. 13 MR. HUSSEY: That goes along with my concerns 14 as well, so my tendency is to hold off until the next 1.5 meeting. We've got a two-week break here, almost a 16 two-week break, and we need it. 17 MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Zuroff? MR. ZUROFF: Given the fact that Mr. Schwartz 18 19 has made it clear that our responding to his responses 20 prejudices him --21 MR. JESSE GELLER: May. 22 MR. ZUROFF: -- may prejudice him, it seems 23 like his complaints bear up fruit here because we 24 haven't had a chance to respond to his responses.

And I understand what you're trying to do, 1 2. Ms. Netter, to generate some discussion about what we have before us, but I echo Chris. I didn't have time to read all of this today, and maybe it would be more 5 productive if we had a chance to overview all of the 6 comments and incorporate them. And maybe what we can do is -- because we have the ability to actually have 8 some time, maybe we can all prepare our comments in writing and we can share them before we next discuss? 9 10 I don't know if that's appropriate. 11 MS. NETTER: Yeah. I think the better thing 12 is to do it at the hearing. 13 MR. HUSSEY: I think the one thing I would be 14 willing to say, I think, is that I think you're in the 15 right general direction. 16 MS. NETTER: That's sort of what I'm --17 MR. HUSSEY: I don't see -- I didn't see 18 anything. And even -- I did go through most of the 19 neighborhood stuff. I didn't see anything there that I 20 thought really was going to upset the entire draft. 21 MS. NETTER: That's kind of the stuff I'm 22 looking for. Or, oh, my God, you absolutely missed 23 these 17 different -- I mean, it's not just me. 24 all of us.

1 I think you have a fine skeleton. MR. ZUROFF: 2 That was Mark Zuroff, MR. JESSE GELLER: 3 folks. I hear your comments. The only one that I 5 think -- in which I disagree with you -- and hopefully Mr. Schwartz will not be offended by this comment --6 but I don't think that we would be prejudiced by a discussion, notwithstanding that we have not seen his comments. So that's -- I agree with -- in general with 10 everything else you gentlemen have said, but I think we 11 are capable of having a discussion. 12 MR. SCHWARTZ: I'll withdraw the use of the 13 word "prejudiced." 14 What I really meant to say, in all 15 seriousness, is I don't think you can have, really, a 16 complete informed discussion, in my opinion, my 17 judgment, without considering some of the issues that 18 we've raised. And we totally understand that you 19 haven't had that --20 MR. JESSE GELLER: And as I think Mr. Hussey 21 has said and Mr. Book has said and Mr. Zuroff has said, 22 I think that works equally true of comments we've 23 received from the neighborhood too. 24 MS. NETTER: Let me add one thing, which is

just for the record. The intention here was -- because 1 2 of the complexity of this project and the voluminous input into it from the community, the various boards, the consultants -- that we were trying -- because that 5 40 days is going to go extremely quickly -- to expedite the process as much as possible. So I hear your 6 concerns, and we'll just move forward as best we can. 8 MR. JESSE GELLER: Any other agenda items for 9 this evening? 10 Mr. Hussey, I know you want to say something. 11 MR. HUSSEY: No. 12 MR. JESSE GELLER: Okay. So our next hearing 13 will be January 5, 2015 where we pick up a discussion 14 of the conditions. And at that point, hopefully 15 everybody will have reviewed all of the materials. 16 Edie Netter has something to say. 17 MS. NETTER: Let's just play this out. Let's 18 assume the hearing closes on the 5th. I just wanted to 19 generally have a sense -- don't fall off your seat, but 20 I'm thinking you might need to meet, just on this, 21 probably every week. 22 MR. HUSSEY: I would assume so myself. 23 MR. JESSE GELLER: You mean until we retire? 24 MS. NETTER: No. But I'm checking this out

- 1 because in making this decision, you're also saying
- 2 we're going to get this done to your satisfaction in 40
- 3 days.
- 4 MR. BOOK: I assumed we would be meeting every
- 5 week in the 40-day period.
- 6 MR. JESSE GELLER: Mr. Zuroff, you look shell
- 7 shocked.
- 8 MR. ZUROFF: No. 40 days and 40 nights.
- 9 MR. JESSE GELLER: I want to wish everyone a
- 10 happy New Year and happy holiday.
- 11 MR. GLADSTONE: I have a process suggestion.
- MR. JESSE GELLER: Suggestion or question?
- 13 MR. GLADSTONE: Suggestion. It's going to go
- 14 to the staff, though.
- Perhaps -- now, I know that when I submitted
- 16 my written comments, I did it on a numbered paragraph-
- by-paragraph basis. Assuming others did similarly,
- 18 perhaps it would be useful if the staff would compile a
- 19 paragraph-by-paragraph compilation of the comments so
- you don't just have running comments from each person,
- 21 but for each item that has a comment, that you have all
- the comments in one place.
- MS. STEINFELD: That's in process on an
- 24 ongoing basis.

```
MR. GLADSTONE: Fabulous. I hope you're
 1
 2
      describing them, these other comments.
 3
               MR. JESSE GELLER: Thank you, Mr. Gladstone.
 4
      Thank you, everyone.
                (Proceedings suspended at 8:28 p.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

```
I, Kristen C. Krakofsky, Court Reporter and
 1
      Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of
 2
      Massachusetts, certify:
               That the foregoing proceedings were taken
      before me at the time and place therein set forth and
 5
      that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of
 6
      my shorthand notes so taken.
               I further certify that I am not a relative or
 9
      employee of any of the parties, nor am I financially
10
      interested in the action.
11
               I declare under penalty of perjury that the
12
      foregoing is true and correct.
13
               Dated this 5th day of January, 2015.
14
      Kristen Krakofsky, Notary Public
15
      My commission expires November 3, 2017.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

	ı	1	
A	action	agreed	31:6 36:20
Abby	28:5 59:10	47:13	apologize
2:20 33:23	actual	agreements	20:21
ability	31:4	36:24	appeal
34:18 54:7	add	ahead	46:12
able	29:14 36:18 44:17	22:18	Appeals
20:7	55:24	Allison	1:5 30:2,3,4,6,11
	added	2:8	32:23 33:5,8 46:13
absolutely 49:11 54:22	34:23	allow	47:13
	addition	17:14 47:13	Appearances
absolving	34:24 38:8	allowed	2:1
26:9	additional	22:17 27:16 44:20	applaud
absorb	35:24 37:11 38:11,15	allowing	25:20
38:2	51:15	39:3	applicable
abuts	address	alternate	29:7
46:11	10:22	9:23	
abutted	addressed	9:23 alternative	applicant
31:2 46:19			3:6 4:1,4,5 7:7 9:10,13
abutter	6:2 14:10 24:1 37:3	9:16 10:10	13:9 26:3 29:3 45:5
20:20	adequacy	amend	45:8
abutters	25:13	18:20	applicant's
22:9 24:4	adequate	amendments	53:4
abutting	25:16 28:12	5:11 48:24	application
9:17 26:15 46:16 47:3	adequately	amount	1:7 18:8
accept	26:20 27:8	21:6 41:19 42:10	applied
20:4	administerial	analyses	9:12
acceptable	5:21	37:23	apply
16:14	advice	analysis	8:1
accepts	34:17	28:2 30:1	applying
45:23	advisors	annually	30:18
access	52:9	35:9	appreciate
22:19,21,22 23:10,21	affect	answer	36:22 42:17 44:18
25:11 28:7 31:16	27:14 34:3 49:7 53:9	6:5 40:4	appropriate
38:21	affirmative	answered	43:20,23 44:8 54:10
accommodate	4:15	42:14	approvals
35:3	affordable	anticipate	29:5
accommodations	11:7,14,15 22:1 23:19	35:13	approve
35:9	40:13,16	anticipated	21:21 32:16
accomplished	agency	35:5	approved
13:4	11:10,21	anticipates	18:8
account	agenda	37:12	approximately
50:24 51:15	56:8	Anybody	36:8
	ago	10:7 17:24 48:1	architectural
accurate	9:7	apartment	37:21
10:11	agree	23:2	area
acknowledged	9:20 19:20 39:18 55:9	apartments	17:4 46:6
28:18	7.20 17.20 37.10 33.7	apar inicitis	17.7 70.0
	I	I	I

	I		I
areas	50:18 52:5	5:23	1:5 2:2 5:9 10:23
13:1,7,15		believe	11:18 14:4,16 16:4
arguments	B	3:13 4:12 7:9 10:11	20:1,5,7 21:20 22:7
29:19	back	belonged	22:11,12,15 23:4,11
articulate	4:3,19 8:18,22 9:17,20	31:5 32:4,18	26:7 27:1,6,12,13,18
5:22	17:19 21:5 27:21	benefit	27:24 30:4,7,12,19
aside	40:16,18	22:5 39:13,14,16 40:2	31:10 39:12 43:4,13
9:19	backyards	40:10 42:21	44:24 45:19,21 46:13
asked	46:16,17,19,23 47:3	benefiting	47:12 50:20 51:11
10:10 14:17 21:13	bag	41:15	52:8,11
45:7,22	26:18	benefits	boards
asking	Baker	40:1	21:11 43:9,11 56:3
4:20 8:20 25:18 27:24	35:6 36:5,8,12,14,19	Bennett	board's
42:14	37:6 38:8,23 39:8	2:12 9:3,3 12:9,13	23:9
asks	41:24	13:8 15:5 16:2,3	Book
22:20 25:12	balancing	17:12,16	2:4 6:18,20 19:20 53:3
aspects	28:20	best	55:21 57:4
13:10	barring	21:24,24 44:21 51:5	Boston
assessment	34:17	52:7 56:7	1:17
28:1	based	better	break
Associate	6:11 8:10 23:16 25:5	8:12 21:22 24:24 48:9	12:3 53:15,16
2:6	basic	54:11	Brief
Associates	33:11	Beverly	40:3
2:11	basically	2:18,23,24 20:19	briefly
assume	11:4 26:8,9 30:7 31:15	46:11,19 47:21	9:8 23:12
18:1 56:18,22	32:1,7,20,21,23	beyond	bringing
assumed	33:12,13 49:21	41:5	36:14
57:4	basis	BHS	broad
assuming	3:10 48:11 57:17,24	37:13,15,22,23 38:9	52:15
4:17,23 6:1 57:17	bear	BHS's	Brookline
attendance	53:23	38:2	1:5,8,12 21:12 28:23
36:6 45:3	bears	Bill	34:5,6,13 35:13,16
attended	45:11	20:19	37:7,11 38:6 39:1,6
44:22	bedroom	bins	44:21 46:16
audible	25:6	27:4	buffer
18:2 48:2	bedrooms	bit	46:22
authority	21:8 24:16,18 25:5	18:20,23 23:5 44:6	build
32:24 33:6,9	37:1	53:11	31:5 34:17
automatically	beginning	blasting	building
29:21	49:2	24:6 46:5	2:12 8:7,11,17 9:1,4,8
available	begs	blocking	9:15 10:1,5,12 23:2
24:4	3:7 6:24	27:18	29:2,20 31:23 34:24
average	behalf	Bluestein	36:11
8:17 38:12	34:1 39:1	2:9	buildings
aware	belabor	board	7:20 8:1 31:6 32:20
	1	1	1

24.20 46.17 24 47.0	antogoming	Chiumenti	aloso
34:20 46:17,24 47:9	categories	Chiumenti	close
built	52:15	2:19 21:2 29:12,12	6:1 15:21 24:5 44:16
36:10 47:13,22	causes	choose	closed
burden	32:19	49:12	7:5 20:9
26:23 45:11	ceded	chooses	closes
business	47:18	52:12	5:9 56:18
33:5	certain	CHR	Cochrane
bylaw	7:19 13:10	6:8 40:10	2:9
9:12 17:3	certainly	Chris	cohabit
by-paragraph	18:16,19 38:4 49:5	2:5 54:3	25:4
57:17	52:24	chronic	come
	certify	27:3	9:5 18:5 23:13 30:23
C	59:3,8	circle	36:9 38:9 47:4
C	chaff	41:23	comes
1:21 59:1	13:24	circulated	44:16
calc	Chairman	51:23 52:4	comfortable
9:23	2:3	citations	47:1
calculation	challenge	27:5	coming
8:8,11 9:16,20 10:11	8:4 34:11	citing	34:10
calculations	chance	30:24	
8:14			commence
caliber	50:22 53:24 54:5	citizen	29:2
14:22	change	43:16	comment
	17:7 38:5	citizens	44:17 55:6 57:21
call	changed	45:3	commented
8:24 31:8 51:7	14:5,6	claim	45:15
calling	changes	45:5	comments
3:4	5:4,7,24 11:5 38:20,21	clarification	4:19,21 5:17,20 16:23
campus	48:8	15:6	18:6,6,10,13,17,18
37:23	characterize	clarify	18:19,24 20:2,6,22
capable	5:24 30:17	10:4 14:18	24:8 25:7,7 29:15
55:11	charging	clarifying	43:7,14 48:7 49:7,7
capacity	25:17	42:24	49:10 50:5,13,21
36:10 37:9	chart	class	53:4,6,8,10 54:6,8
capital	14:18,20	34:23	55:4,9,22 57:16,19
34:4 35:17	check	classrooms	57:20,22 58:2
car	13:5 17:10	34:21 35:1,8 36:15	commission
25:20	checking	clear	28:23 59:16
carefully	56:24	6:8 11:19 14:9 16:10	commissioner
20:6 23:17	checklist	29:22 53:19	2:12 9:1,4
case	4:4,24 5:24 7:4	clearer	commissions
1:6 30:22,23 31:1,18	Chestnut	13:15 14:5	43:9,12
31:20,24 32:12,15,16	1:7 2:14 3:5 22:10,21	clearly	commitment
33:12,16,16 46:1	39:14	38:16 39:24 48:8	42:2
cases			
30:23	children	client	committed
30.23	36:21 39:8	3:9	42:3

	T	ı	1
committee	44:1,2 48:16	48:21 49:20 50:1	corrective
30:2,6,11 33:5,9 34:1	conditioned	56:4	28:5
34:2 39:1	30:15	Consulting	correspondence
Committee's	conditions	2:13	28:22
30:3 38:14	5:12 12:19,20,21 18:7	contemplated	cost
Commonwealth	18:7,13,13,18 21:21	36:4	38:12,16
59:2	22:2,4,5,13 30:10,18	content	costs
community	30:20 36:22 37:4	48:6	38:9,16
39:2 42:5 56:3	42:8,18 43:7 45:4,6,9	contingent	counsel
compilation	45:11,17,18 48:24	22:13	1:10 51:5 52:9
49:13 57:19	49:20 50:19,21 52:6	continue	counts
compile	52:10,16 53:9,10	18:16 20:2	23:7
57:18	56:14	continued	course
complaints	configuration	3:4 6:21	6:24 13:21 20:18
53:23	38:20	contribute	29:14 30:14 33:2
complete	conflict	41:22	46:19 49:17
4:1 55:16	42:23	contributing	Court
completed	confuse	41:23	32:6,10,22,23 33:7,8
7:4	9:14,24	control	33:13 59:1
completely	confusion	12:24	courts
39:18	29:18,20	controversial	22:17
complexity	consequences	27:23	Cox
56:2	24:20	conversation	2:20 33:23,23
complicated	Conservation	38:5 50:14 53:1	co-plaintiffs
8:23	43:13	convert	22:9
comply	consider	40:16	created
4:9	27:18 29:8 39:2 40:15	converted	46:22
comprehensive	47:15,22 51:3,8	40:13	crew
24:13	52:17	converting	47:4
concepts	consideration	40:18	crowded
37:22	49:1,3	copied	36:12
conceptual	considered	28:23	current
21:16 43:22	20:6 28:20 38:8	copies	21:23 37:15
concern	considering	3:15,17	currently
5:14,16 20:10 32:19	37:19 55:17	сору	34:24 38:3
37:10 51:1 53:12	consistent	4:7	cut
concerned	9:12	Corporation	24:6 42:16
24:11 34:2 52:12	constraints	1:15	
concerns	44:23	correct	D
22:4 31:15 32:11	construction	3:12 4:10 17:16 59:6	Dan
33:14 37:3 53:13	28:8 29:2	59:12	2:12 9:3 12:8 13:6
56:7	consultant	corrected	15:4
condition	28:6 35:12	3:11	dangerous
17:6 23:10 24:21,21	consultants	corrections	27:17
24:23 28:24 29:16	34:16 35:10 37:24	5:6,11 6:11 7:8	date
		,	

	1	1	
4:2 49:14	delineate	38:3 41:7 46:20	distance
Dated	12:18 13:14	Devotion	9:16 46:23,23 47:1
59:13	delineating	35:1,19	distant
day	13:7	differ	47:1
10:17 19:11,16 59:13	delineation	21:16	district
days	14:21	different	36:6 38:23
56:5 57:3,8	denial	8:1 36:16 37:19 48:13	disturb
deadline	31:21 32:6 33:13	54:23	13:7
18:23 19:7	denied	differently	doing
deal	21:3 30:15 31:16,20	8:6	7:14 11:16 19:12 48:9
27:8 39:14	32:10,16	difficult	double
dealings	densely	13:20	17:10
13:8	34:10	diligence	do-not-disturb
debt	deny	42:20	12:18
35:17	33:15	dimensional	draft
December	Department	24:2	22:20 24:12 36:23
1:9 3:5	9:9,9 19:4,23	dining	41:17 43:11 48:4,6
decided	depending	24:17	51:10 53:11 54:20
11:8,9 12:6 21:20	15:22	direction	drainage
32:23	described	49:5 52:23,23 54:15	28:3
deciduous	35:21 36:2 45:2	Director	dramatic
14:22	describing	2:8	38:20
decision	58:2	disagree	drawings
11:24 22:6,20 23:16	design	50:13 55:5	7:18 12:22,23 17:8
23:21 24:12 25:12	21:16 43:22 45:19	disagrees	Drive
29:10 30:6 36:23	destruction	10:13	27:16
40:23 43:11 49:22	46:4	disappointed	driveway
57:1	detail	44:19	31:8
decisions	14:6,7 30:4	disappointing	driveways
27:13,14 41:3,6,11	detailed	45:13	27:15
48:4	50:20	discretion	driving
decision-making	details	30:19	23:19
39:21	22:5	discuss	due
declare	determination	10:20 42:8 51:4 54:9	42:20
59:11	13:16 16:5	discussed	
decreased	determine	9:7 23:4,11 30:16	E
21:6	9:11	32:12 34:12 45:4	earlier
decried	developed	discussion	18:24 30:1 41:18
21:12	46:22 47:2	50:4,19 51:2,14 52:6	easement
defer	developer	52:14 54:2 55:8,11	33:4
52:24	11:23 26:16 31:5	55:16 56:13	easements
defined	32:24 45:10,16,22	discussions	33:6,10
23:17	46:2	41:4 52:9	easier
delay	development	disincentive	12:13 13:13 32:15
19:5	23:11 28:8 36:5 37:5	25:19	echo
	•	•	•

54:3	engaged	everything's	explain
Ed	37:21	29:23	33:8
47:4	enrollment	evidence	explained
Edie	34:15 35:9 36:3 37:13	29:4 30:9 49:13	7:15
18:11 56:16	37:15	evidently	exposure
Edith	enrollments	18:22	13:1
2:10,11	35:6	exact	extension
education	enrollment-driven	15:16	3:6,8,9 4:13,18,20
34:7	38:16	exactly	5:16 6:22
effect	entire	14:11	extensions
52:13	40:7,22,24 41:13	examples	5:1
efforts	45:20,20 46:7 54:20	24:12	extent
35:4	,	excellent	5:10
either	entirely 43:20	42:13	
5:12 27:18 34:17			extra 37:8
	equal 37:10	excess	
41:11,22 52:10		36:10	extraordinary
electronic	equally	excessive	30:19
6:9 7:10	55:22	26:15	extremely
electronically	erosion	exclusion	56:5
3:18 4:6	12:23	35:17	E2
elementary	errors	excuse	12:3,10
34:13,19,23 35:11,23	5:6	50:8	F
37:14,18 41:12	escalate	existing	Fabulous
elevations	27:9	12:19,20,21 25:11	58:1
15:6	escrow	expand	
else's	41:16,19	34:18	face
33:3	especially	expanded	35:4,17 facilities
email	41:8	25:24 35:2 37:22	35:16
41:18	Esquire	expanding	
embraces	2:9,10,15	25:11	fact
34:6	essentially	expansion	19:14 32:3 43:18 52:6
emergency	7:3 28:24 49:16	34:4 35:13,15,18	53:18
31:16	estimate	38:17	failure
emphasize	38:4,12	expansions	27:8
36:1	Eve	35:12	fair
employee	20:15	expedite	23:16,16
59:9	evening	56:5	fairly
encouraged	3:3,7 9:3 39:5 50:19	expeditiously	4:1 5:5 15:21
18:16	51:21 52:4,14 56:9	34:18 35:20	fairness
enforce	evergreen	Expenditures	5:18
24:22	14:23	35:7	faith
enforced	evergreens	experience	42:2
25:23 37:2	16:12,21,22	5:8 45:20	fall
enforcement	everybody	expires	35:6 56:19
25:1 26:19	51:24 56:15	59:16	falls

36:5	find	38:19	3:7,9 5:11,17 9:13
familiar	9:11 11:1	foregoing	18:18 49:24 52:18
31:9	finding	59:4,6,12	59:8
families	33:14 43:19,24	form	Furthermore
36:21 38:22	findings	29:6	28:9
	28:19 43:17	forma	future
family-sized	28.19 43.17 fine	21:13	37:11 40:18
36:17			37:11 40:18
far	16:3 17:6,12 40:5	format	G
3:15 21:22 36:19	50:20 55:1	6:9 7:10 49:22	gain
38:17 39:18	firms	formidable	22:24
fashion	37:21	34:11	
42:13	first	formula	Geller
Fax	7:21 14:19 16:24 21:1	9:18	2:3,13 3:3,17,23 6:5,7
1:18	21:2 22:7 24:19	formulating	6:17,19,23 7:9 8:3,3
fee	34:15 44:24	53:9	8:10,16,19,24 10:6
25:17,19,21,22,22,22	fit	forth	10:16 11:3,4 12:2,11
25:23,24	21:15	21:5 36:23 59:5	12:17 13:20,21 14:2
feel	five	forum	14:15 15:15,21 16:8
10:21 21:21 22:12	7:15 15:12,20,23	10:21	16:18,22 17:17,23
44:19	16:17	forward	18:3 19:6,8,12,18
feet	fix	9:22 38:3 39:4 49:14	20:10,17 29:11 33:22
9:17 10:2 17:6,13 21:7	42:1	56:7	42:7 43:2 44:12 46:9
36:11 47:14,14	floating	found	47:24 48:3,15 49:16
felt	11:22	35:11	50:7,9,10,15 51:21
13:3 21:3 27:15 36:6	flooding	four	51:23 52:3,18 53:17
fence	31:22	7:15 35:1 47:13 50:7,8	53:21 55:2,20 56:8
14:3,4,6,7,13,16 47:7	floor	frankly	56:12,23 57:6,9,12
fences	1:11 7:21 45:20	31:9 52:13	58:3
14:4	flow	Friday	general
fewer	11:15	19:9	52:21 54:15 55:9
45:18	focus	front	generally
figure	42:18	17:18 41:24	18:9 43:22 56:19
38:13	folks	fruit	generate
filings	55:3	53:23	54:2
29:4,5	follow	full	generated
final	30:5	4:10 6:9 20:11 28:7	38:17
3:11 4:22 24:2 40:21	followed	fully	generically
5.11 4.22 24.2 40.21 finality	34:16 44:8,9	19:2 20:6,24 23:9 51:4	5:13 15:23
	· ·	function	gentlemen
22:14,17 finance	following 35:7	26:14 28:4	55:10
	follows		getting
35:15,18		fundamentally	4:18 17:15 18:24
financial	30:6	31:10 33:11 38:5	45:24
38:10 40:1 41:9	foot	funding	give
financially	17:4	35:19	32:24 33:16 49:5
41:10 59:9	force	further	<u> </u>

given	28:7	22:22	hired
4:12 51:16 53:18	graph	happy	28:7
giving	8:21	19:24 42:11 57:10,10	historic
33:4	graphic	hard	28:17,18,21
glad	8:22	3:15,17 4:7 6:10 15:22	Historical
11:19	grass	health	28:23
Gladstone	32:21,21 33:1	26:24 27:5 37:8	history
57:11,13 58:1,3	great	hear	43:8
, ,	18:11 39:14 46:24	39:12,15,22 40:1	Hoar
go 8:6,16 19:3 20:24	green	42:11 55:4 56:6	26:16 47:14
21:13 25:9 32:24	30:8 46:4	heard	hold
33:3 38:3 51:6 54:18	Groton	6:6 16:24 39:17 42:15	5:15 53:14
56:5 57:13	30:22 31:1,2,2	50:3	holding
goal	group	hearing	26:18
25:20	45:1	1:5 3:4 5:9 6:1,21,21	holdings
God	grow	7:1,1,4 20:1,8 44:16	32:8
54:22	37:16	45:17 51:6 52:11,11	holiday
goes	grown	54:12 56:12,18	57:10
22:18 53:13	34:13	hearings	holidays
going	growth	42:9	4:13
5:15 9:22 11:2,8,14,15	34:16 36:2,3 37:13	Heath	holistic
11:16,23 13:14,16	guess	34:22	41:8
21:5 22:8 24:5,6	15:5 17:4 23:24	height	homeowners
27:23 31:7 41:11	guessing	7:20,22 8:7,14 9:2,5	47:19
42:1 47:5,6 48:6,8,10	25:18	9:11 10:5 14:21,23	hope
53:8 54:20 56:5 57:2	guy	15:12 16:13,15,16,19	20:22 24:3,24 29:8,9
57:13	8:22	17:2,5 31:23	48:21,23 49:4 58:1
golf		heights	hopefully
46:19	H	14:18	24:9 55:5 56:14
good	half	helpful	hoping
3:3 9:3 27:24 39:5	31:23	10:3 14:1	4:22 50:2
45:8	Hancock	helping	hours
gotten	27:2 28:18 34:3 36:4,9	35:12 42:5	27:19 44:18
4:10	36:18 38:2 46:20,21	high	house
Goulston	handful	34:7 35:13,22 37:12	36:21 46:24 47:2
2:15	7:14	37:19 39:8 41:12	houses
go-ahead	handle	higher	46:18 47:5,13,17,21
22:13	37:24	36:19	housing
grade	handled	highlights	22:1 23:19 30:2,3,5,11
7:23,24 8:17 10:3,3	27:7	20:24	32:22 33:4,8 40:14
7.25,24 8.17 10.5,5 grades	hands	highly	40:16
8:6 37:14	18:9 26:10,22	27:23	
	happen		Hussey
grant	29:22 41:6 47:21 50:3	Hill	2:5 7:6,11,17 8:9,13
3:9 23:20 33:6,9	happens	1:7 2:14 3:5 22:10,21	8:18,21 16:15,20
granted	паррепз	39:14	18:20 19:7,10,14,22

2:4 45:19 48:13,18,20 27:16 interesting independent 31:18,20 32:14 49:9,15,23 51:18,22 Joseph Internet 53:13 54:13,17 55:20 28:6 2:13 56:10,11,22 indicate 39:23 Joyce 9:18 12:21 16:6 21:2 interpretation 2:21 39:5 I 25:13 17:1 judgment idea indicated involved 55:17 6:1 45:4 51:17 14:19 16:16 17:21 31:1 32:9 Judicial ideas 26:12 issue 32:6,10,22 33:7,8,12 15:20 37:4 indicates 9:2,5,14,19,24 14:10 Judith identifies 2:23 44:13 13:9 26:24 27:3 45:15 13:12 46:21 indicating juncture identify 4:7 7:13 issued 15:2 individuals 29:3,19 K immediate 25:4 issues 35:4 K influenced 5:21 6:2 10:21 13:18 impact 34:17 36:12 47:8 52:22,23 55:17 28:24 36:6 37:10 Kathryn informed item 38:10 39:3,19 40:24 2:9 55:16 57:21 41:13 46:5,7 Kathy infractions items 45:1 important 27:10 7:14.15 30:5 48:7 56:8 17:9 27:3 32:19 38:19 keep infrastructure 42:20,21 43:17,24 9:15 26:7.9 importantly January kind input 46:6 49:6 3:8 4:13 7:1 18:17 8:22 15:22 37:3 39:19 51:11.11 56:3 impossible 45:1 56:13 59:13 40:21 42:2,22,23 inspector 24:22 38:1 52:20,22 54:21 Jesse 10:12 2:3 3:3,17,23 6:5,7,17 kindergartners inadequate instances 26:6 6:19,23 7:9 8:24 36:15 23:14 include 10:6.16 11:3 12:11 kinds institution 17:23 18:3 19:6,8,12 41:10 24:15 28:12 29:5 40:10 41:14 36:14 19:18 20:10,17 29:11 know insufficient included 33:22 42:7 43:2 3:16 4:2 5:5,6,14,15 35:5 14:20 24:19 27:14 44:12 46:9 47:24 7:24 8:23 11:16 integrity 36:24 14:24 15:10 17:11 48:3.15 49:16 50:7 46:13 including 50:10,15 51:21,23 19:3 21:18 23:14 intelligent 18:21 22:9 29:23 52:3,18 53:17,21 24:4 25:2 37:15 41:6 24:8 43:12 55:2,20 56:8,12,23 41:23 42:6,12,17 intent 57:6,9,12 58:3 incorporate 44:8 46:1,7 49:6 44:1 36:3 50:22 54:6 Joe 50:12,20 51:6 52:1,8 intention increase 52:13,22 53:4,11 42:16 56:1 8:3,3,10,16,19 11:4 23:3 40:9 54:10 56:10 57:15 12:2,17 13:21 14:2 interest increasing 14:15 15:15,21 16:8 knows 21:24 42:23 44:21 16:18,22 17:17 35:9 22:7 52:8 interested Independence **Jonathan** Krakofsky 59:10

1:21 59:1,15	legends	30:5	12:10,14 26:12 30:9
Kristen	14:3	Liss	39:19 40:1 53:8
1:21 59:1,15	Leichtner	45:7	low
Krokidas	2:23 44:13,13	list	38:4,12
2:9	lengthy	4:19 6:12 9:10,23	lucky
2.9	48:8	10:14 24:12,13 49:21	50:10
L	letter	*	Lupini
lack		listed	_
24:11	5:4 7:12 21:1 51:19	28:19	41:5
landscape	letters	listened	M
14:17	18:12 48:22 51:15	47:8	M
	letting	little	2:10,11
landscaping 15:11 25:8	43:1	14:10 18:20,23 31:9	
	let's	44:4,6 53:11	machinations
language	5:23 19:10 56:17,17	live	47:7
24:15 36:24 44:4,5	level	34:8 46:11	maintain
large	45:21	lived	26:17 30:14
23:2 34:9	Levin	34:9	maintenance
largely	2:14 3:13,18 4:15,17	Living	26:14,21 28:10,11
49:13	6:3,4	24:17	major
larger	levy	local	31:2
37:14 38:9	25:22	22:1 23:3,18,23 38:20	making
latest	levying	location	16:4 52:15 57:1
24:3	25:23	11:7 38:2	management
lattice	light	lofts	26:13,13 27:22 28:9
14:14	17:1,3,17	24:19 36:21	mandated
law	lighting	long	23:18 28:5
25:2 29:7 44:23	16:24	4:4 17:13 31:12 34:9	manner
Lawrence	limit	42:15,15 44:16	19:3
35:1	12:24 13:1	longest	Marc
lawsuit	limitations	15:24	2:14
22:8,14,16 29:17,23	17:2	long-term	Maria
lawyers	limited	34:4 37:12 46:6	4:2 5:22
45:1	18:6 31:14 44:3	look	Mark
layers	limiting	16:11 30:11 39:22	2:6 55:2
13:18	30:20		marked
leases	limit-of-work	53:7 57:6	48:12 49:23
24:14		looked	market
ledge	12:22	14:13	40:14,18
13:11	Lincoln	looking	Mass
left	1:16 37:7	12:14 13:17 14:11,12	28:22
23:21 27:12,15,18,19	line	15:8 16:10 36:13	Massachusetts
	9:17,21 10:2 12:22	41:20 50:12 54:22	1:12,17 59:3
LegaLink	20:14 30:7,7 47:9	lose	
1:15	lines	22:23	MassDevelopment
legend	47:22	lot	21:17 22:10
14:5	line-by-line	8:1 9:17,21 10:2 12:3	materials

	1	İ	İ
56:15	31:13	27:17	neighborhoods
matriculate	Merrill	move	32:2 38:23
37:14	1:15	5:23 34:18 35:20 39:4	neighborhood's
matter	method	49:14 56:7	53:6
16:4 19:14 34:8 49:18	9:10	moved	neighbors
mature	MHC	17:18	45:13
16:6	29:5,6	moving	Neil
max	midrise	34:21 47:16	2:22 43:3
17:14	9:15	mow	Netter
maximum	million	33:1	2:10,11 3:21,24 4:12
17:5 25:3	38:15	Murphy	4:22 5:20 6:6,16
mean	minds	2:9 45:1,10	10:18 11:12 12:7,9
4:16 10:2,18 18:21	27:22		13:5,19,23 15:3,19
38:15 39:22 40:20	minimal	N	16:1,14,21 17:10,15
41:2,23,24 42:1	21:14	Nagler	17:22 20:4 49:2,11
46:24 49:12 52:24	minimum	45:1	50:2,8,11 51:9,20
54:23 56:23	25:21	name	52:20 54:2,11,16,21
meaning	minor	33:23 39:5 44:13	55:24 56:16,17,24
11:13	43:6	46:10	Netter's
meant	minute	nature	45:23
55:14	20:22 35:14	5:6 43:18	never
measured	minutes	necessarily	45:22 46:2,7
25:14,15	29:14	29:21 49:8	nevertheless
measurements	missed	necessary	19:15
28:13	54:22	29:4 35:15	new
meet	mission	need	9:23 10:14 14:19
4:24 56:20	34:7	3:19 4:13 5:10 6:14	19:11,13,16 20:15
meeting	mitigation	16:1 19:2 20:7 22:1	34:9 35:1 36:17 38:8
19:1,1 20:20 29:13	23:8 26:6	23:18 24:7 25:21	38:17 41:12,12 57:10
33:24 44:14,22,24	mix	28:10 29:18 48:6	nice
53:15 57:4	13:12	50:4 53:16 56:20	41:24
member	modest	needed	nights
2:6 20:20 29:13 33:24	21:9 41:19	4:4	57:8
33:24 44:14 45:19	monitor	needs	nine-page
members	28:11	5:11 23:17 28:23,24	5:3
2:2,17 11:18 18:4 20:7	monitoring	40:6	ninth
51:10	26:19	negative	35:11,23
mention	months	39:19 41:13 43:14	nod
18:12 30:22 31:19	30:16	46:6	4:15
33:16 44:15 48:14,21	Morelli	negatively	Notary
mentioned	4:3,11 12:8,10 13:6	40:24	59:2,15
27:21 28:10 35:22	14:13 15:4	neighborhood	note
MEPA	morning	23:23 26:23 46:14,15	18:15
29:5,7	41:18	46:16 47:3,23 49:9	notes
merged	motorists	49:20 54:19 55:23	6:11 48:12 59:7

	l		
noticed	offered	ought	22:19,21 23:20
8:13	42:11 43:12	5:18	part
notification	offering	outcropping	5:4 44:3
29:6	18:13	12:19 13:2	particular
notified	Office	outcroppings	9:1
43:10 notion	1:10 oh	13:11 32:20	particularly 23:3 32:13 33:20
7:2	-	outright	
	49:9,11 51:22 54:22	21:18 31:17,21	parties 59:9
notwithstanding 55:8	okay 7:11 8:18,24 11:1 12:7	outstrip 38:17	
November	15:3 16:20 17:22	overall	pass 50:1
45:24 59:16	18:11 19:18,19 20:10	29:10	
43:24 39:10 number	•		pattern 34:16
1:6 12:22 15:9 16:23	40:4 48:15 49:15,23 52:3 56:12	overcrowding 35:5	
			pause 40:3
18:12 22:4,20 24:14	once 6:15	overflowing 27:4	
25:3,5,5,10 26:3,7 28:21 34:9 36:19	one-bedroom	Override	pay 23:23 26:5
	36:20	38:14	
43:8,19,20,21 44:1,2 48:22	one-third	overrides	payers 35:24
numbered	36:9	40:8	
57:16		overview	peak
nurseries	ongoing 26:14 28:12 57:24	54:5	7:21,23 27:19
		overwhelm	pedestrians 27:17
15:1	on-site 13:16		
nursery 14:20		37:6	peer 49:18
14:20	opaque 14:8,8	owner 40:12	
0	· ·	40:12	penalties
objected	open 20:1 23:22 25:8	P	25:1 27:8 28:5,15 44:9 penalty
31:10		Pages	25:15,23 59:11
obligation	operating 38:15	1:2	pending
26:17	opinion	page-by-page	29:17
obtained	22:15 55:16	48:11	_,
22:23	opinions	paragraph	people 18:10 20:14,21 25:6
obvious	43:12	57:16	32:14 45:14 48:16
6:17 39:13	opportunity	paragraph-by-para	49:18
obviously	18:4 20:11 51:3 52:17	57:19	percent
5:14 39:24	53:5,7	parcel	21:7,7,8,8 23:7 34:14
occur	opposed	31:1	37:13
24:6 26:21 28:15,16	4:18 50:12	parent	performed
occurrence	options	39:7	26:21
21:19	36:14 38:7	parking	performing
offended	order	21:8 22:23,24 23:6	28:14
55:6	35:15 48:5	24:5 25:18,19 41:20	performs
offer	Osborne	44:3 45:18,21 46:4	26:20
18:4,5 43:6	2:20	Parkway	period
, -	2.20	•	Periou
	l		l

42:15 57:5	5:17 6:9,10 10:22	7:23 8:2 12:3 52:7	12:19 13:3
perjury	11:8,11 15:17,18	56:6	pressing
59:11	24:3,3 36:2	postconstruction	23:1
permits	planted	28:1,2	pressure
29:3,18	14:19 16:9,19	potential	43:21
perpetuity	planting	23:5 35:23 37:10	pretty
26:22 28:16	15:11,16,16,18 16:9	power	16:10 44:10
person	16:18	23:9 30:20 40:23	prevent
57:20	plantings	practice	26:15
pertains	15:9,10	36:19	preventing
7:18	play	pre	27:19
phones	26:19 56:17	28:2	previous
52:2	playing	preceded	30:16
pick	42:4	46:20	pre-K
56:13	please	Precinct	34:21
pickup	3:22,23 20:12	29:13 33:24 44:14	printed
27:7	pleased	preference	33:17
pictures	48:11	11:22	privacy
27:1	Plus	prejudice	46:18 47:11,16,19,23
Pierce	13:2	53:22	pro
35:7	point	prejudiced	21:13
place	5:9,17 7:5 8:7,20,20	55:7,13	probably
8:12 24:24 28:11	15:16 17:24 21:4	prejudices	15:24 43:6 56:21
52:10 57:22 59:5	22:19,20 24:1,14	53:20	problem
placed	27:11 28:17,21 40:14	prejudicial	12:4 13:19 23:5,6 42:5
45:4	40:17 50:4 56:14	52:13	problems
places	points	preliminary	23:1 31:11,22,23,24
26:23 44:23	39:10 40:20 52:15	51:13,14	42:1
placing	pole	premature	procedural
30:20	17:3,17,19	53:12	43:8
plan	poles	prepare	procedures
5:7 12:20,20,21,24	17:1,7	54:8	25:2
13:2,12,13,17,18	Pollard	prepared	proceed
14:17 15:16 16:9,16	2:24 46:10,10	19:2	5:2
16:18 21:5,6 25:11	populated	prescribed	proceeding
26:13,14 27:22 28:9	34:10	30:2	23:10
28:11,12 34:4 37:12	population	present	proceedings
planned	34:13	11:2 37:21	3:1 43:18 58:5 59:4
38:3	portable	presented	process
planning	35:8 36:15	53:10	5:18 39:21 44:17,20
2:8 6:14 9:9 19:4,22	pose	preservation	45:2 48:5,9 49:3
30:8 35:20 37:18	39:11	28:17,21 43:14	56:6 57:11,23
43:13 52:22	positive	preserve	produced
43.13 32.22 plans	39:24 43:15	13:10	21:22
3:11 4:1,5,8,23 5:10	possible	preserved	productive
J.11 T.1,J,O,2J J.10	Possinic	preserveu	Productive
	l	l	l

1			
53:1,1 54:5	provisions	40:6	recognize
profound	44:7	raised	23:5
43:5	Pu	55:18	recommend
project	2:18 20:19,19 37:3	raises	30:10 33:18
21:3,14,21,22,23	public	6:23	recommendations
22:13,18 23:19 24:15	2:17 10:21 18:5 20:1	Rangeley	29:9 48:23
26:9 29:6 30:14,18	24:8 26:5,24 27:5,14	47:14,20	reconsider
30:20 31:16 32:9	34:4,6 38:21,22	rare	29:10
33:15,21 34:3 35:18	51:10 52:11,11 59:2	21:19	record
36:3 39:13 40:2	59:15	reach	10:3 56:1
43:15,22 45:5,12	punitive	22:17	reduced
46:1,3,3,8,11 47:8	27:9	read	49:21
56:2	pupil	12:16 18:22 20:8	reduction
projection	38:13	41:17,17 54:4	21:9 23:6 49:17
34:15	purchased	reading	reflect
projects	35:11 40:12	30:23 31:9	21:23
35:21,21	purpose	real	reflected
project's	4:18 10:15 24:23	5:7	36:22
38:18	purposes	realize	Regarding
proof	24:17 37:1	44:23	25:10
45:11	put	really	regulations
properly	11:10 12:5 14:23 17:6	4:23 5:18 13:23 21:6,9	30:3,12
9:12 51:3	24:24 41:19 43:17	22:3,11 23:7,20,22	regulation-by-regul
properties	44:10,15 47:6	30:2,10 40:6,8,14,15	33:20
15:8 26:15	P.C	40:23,24 41:19 42:1	reiterate
property	2:11	42:3,4 54:20 55:14	9:7
31:4 32:4,18 33:1,3	p.m	55:15	rejected
38:18 47:9,18,22	1:9 3:2 7:2 20:13 58:5	Realty	21:18
proposal		1:7 2:14 22:10,21	relate
21:12 23:2 39:4	Q	39:14	18:18
proposed	quality	reason	related
15:10 18:7,13 31:5	26:4,6 34:7	15:13 32:7,12 46:18	31:11
34:2 36:4,17 37:5	question	reasons	relative
protect	6:18,24 7:17 11:12	30:24	59:8
46:13,22 47:23	13:6 39:11 40:5,6	rebuilt	relatively
prove	45:8 57:12	37:23	43:6
45:22 46:2	questions	recall	relay
provide	7:3 10:7 17:24 20:7,8	43:15	20:3
11:7 35:19 46:17	42:14 48:7	received	remaining
provided	quickly	3:19 48:4,21 51:18	10:24
3:6 6:12 14:18 24:7	10:20 56:5	55:23	remedied
provides	quite	receiving	24:10
29:4	21:6,9,19 23:4 41:5	3:11	remember
providing		recognition	40:12
9:15 25:15 34:7	R	43:10	reminds
),10 <u>2</u> 3,13 JT,1	raise	13.10	
	l	I	l

18:11	resident	33:20 48:23 49:24	<u> </u>
remove	39:6,7	53:5	safety
43:21 45:20	residential	reviewed	30:8 31:11,15 32:11
render	38:18 46:15 47:3	9:9 56:15	32:19 33:14
45:12	residents	reviewers	sake
renderings	9:6	49:19	25:9
15:15,19	resist	reviewing	Sam
renovated	43:21	48:5	45:1
35:2	resolution	reviews	samples
renovation	29:17	30:6	26:4
35:18	resolved	right	
renovations	29:23	8:9 10:16 16:22 19:6	sanctuary 26:16 47:14,16,18,19
34:22	resource	41:1,21 42:3 47:6,9	satisfaction
rental	28:19	47:17 49:8 52:23	57:2
34:21 35:8 36:24	respectfully	54:15	
repeated	51:3,5	road	saw 48:12
27:10	respond	2:18,19,20,23,24 16:7	
replied	4:7 38:6 53:24	20:20 23:4 31:2,12	saying 7:9 20:5 40:5 50:3
45:10	responded	32:1 46:11,19 47:15	
Reporter	4:6 7:3	47:20,21	57:1
1:21 59:1	responding	roads	says
repurposing	53:19	23:3 46:5	5:9 14:8 24:14 26:8 28:22
34:20	response	roadway	
request	10:23 18:2 48:2	31:7,14 32:3	scale
3:7 4:14,23 8:14 10:13	responses	rock	12:5,6 15:17
10:17 11:6 12:2,17	53:19,24	13:2	scattered 31:7
28:2	responsibility	role	
requested	26:11	26:19 42:4	scheduled 6:21
5:5 11:5 14:2 17:11	responsible	roof	school
requests	26:8 41:10	7:21,23	34:1,2,10,17 35:1,2,6
4:9 5:1 20:1 35:24	rest	rooms	35:7,11,13,19,22,23
49:1	41:13	24:16,17,17	37:12,16,18,20 38:8
require	restricted	Ruben	39:1,3,8,9 41:3,7,12
11:23 22:15 23:10	26:1	2:24 46:10	41:12
35:23	result	run	schools
required	52:13	48:7,17	34:4,6,19,22,24 36:13
9:19 10:12,15 29:6,7	results	Runkle	37:6,8,14 38:11,21
requires	10:4 26:5	34:22 37:8	38:22 39:20 41:21
26:14 28:10 40:22	retire	running	43:13
requiring	56:23	57:20	school's
37:7	revenues	runoff	35:16 36:5
reside	38:17	26:15 28:13	Schwartz
38:24	review	Russett	2:15 3:14 5:3 7:12
Residences	4:8,20 6:11,14 9:8	2:19 23:4	10:8,9 11:20 50:15
1:8 3:4	12:14 20:11,23 21:13		50:17 51:9 52:5
	,		50.17 51.7 52.5
	1	I	I

53:18 55:6,12	36:8	26:2	24:17 37:1
screen	service	side	slew
14:3	25:11,12,14,16 26:1,2	47:6	18:21
screening	set	sideways	small
16:5,11	4:1 6:9,10 9:19 11:23	47:5	12:6,16 21:7 46:5
seat	12:4,4 19:7,8 30:3	significant	smaller
56:19	36:22 46:15 59:5	32:8 38:9 42:10	34:16 45:18 46:3
second	setback	significantly	sole
22:19 31:19	17:18	46:2	4:18
secondly	settled	similar	solid
24:20	22:14	41:21	14:4,4,16
section	seven-foot	similarly	solution
8:5 25:17 48:16	14:4,6	57:17	23:6
sections	share	simple	solutions
7:19,20,24 34:23	54:9	32:15	37:19
sedimentation	sharpening	simply	somebody
12:24	44:5	22:16 28:22 37:6 41:9	40:5
see	sheet	48:10	someone's
8:10,19,21 13:14	12:5	single	33:2
19:10 21:15 23:15	sheets	38:2	soon
24:9 30:9 35:10	12:3,10,12	site	52:7
39:16 42:2 47:20,21	shell	13:10,14 21:16 29:2	sort
48:11 54:17,17,19	57:6	30:8 35:10 36:16	32:2 54:16
seeing	shifting	37:22 43:23 44:3	sound
4:15 21:20	37:7	situation	27:2
seen	shocked	10:4	sounded
53:4 55:8	57:7	six-foot	31:8
selectmen	short	14:3,7,13	South
43:4,13 45:15	37:5	size	1:8 37:6
sell	shorthand	14:22 15:17 16:9	space
15:1	59:7	sized	25:8,18,19 30:8 34:20
sending	show	16:12 21:14	35:5 36:11 37:12
36:15	7:22 14:6 15:15 16:10	sizes	46:4,17,22 47:10
sense	18:9 45:11	15:22 16:8	spaces
56:19	showed	skeleton	34:21 35:8
sent	7:19,20 15:9	55:1	speak
4:3 41:18	showing	skeptical	9:1 43:1
separate	15:19	27:23	speaking
11:14 13:23 14:2 41:3	shown	skepticism	34:1 43:4
41:7	15:7 16:8 17:3 27:1	26:12	specific
seriousness	shows	skim	10:15 13:11,13 22:2
55:15	8:15,16 9:16 10:1 13:3	10:19,19	specifically
serve	13:12 15:17	skipping	5:12 12:23 14:8
21:24	shuttle	50:9	specifications
serves	25:11,12,14,16,24	sleeping	28:4
		Sicoping	
	I	I	l

	ı	1	í
specificity	24:15	studios	support
15:14	Steinfeld	36:20	25:24
specifics	2:8 3:15 19:24 20:15	study	supposed
24:11 25:1 28:15	20:18 52:1 57:23	28:6 38:14	19:1,2 30:4,13 42:18
specified	Steve	stuff	Supreme
24:20 25:3,4,6	21:1,2 29:12	18:21 19:3 54:19,21	32:6,10,22 33:7,7,12
specifies	Steven	subject	sure
30:12	2:15,19	17:2	4:8 6:19 11:3 17:8
specify	stick	subjective	26:20 28:12,13 42:22
25:21	9:24	23:13	47:12 50:23 52:3
spend	stipulate	submit	surrounded
22:3	27:6	18:16 20:12,12	31:3,4 32:2
spent	stock	submitted	surrounding
44:18	14:21	3:13,14 4:1,24 5:19	46:5
spots	stop	6:9,15 7:12 18:14	suspect
22:23,24	29:21 40:18	20:22 30:1 33:19	50:21
square	stormwater	42:12 49:14 50:20	suspended
21:7 36:11	26:3,13,13 27:21,22	57:15	58:5
squarely	28:3,9,13	submitting	system
36:5	Storrs	4:19 5:19	26:17,20 28:3,14,16
staff	2:15	subsidizing	34:11 36:13 39:3
9:9 57:14,18	story	11:9,21	
staff's	4:10	substantially	T
10:23	Street	21:17	table
stakeholders	1:11,16	substantive	10:1
21:12	streets	5:7 6:1	take
standard	15:7	successfully	4:9 8:5,5 26:4,4 48:24
14:20 23:13	strengthened	34:23	49:3 51:14 52:10,20
standing	29:1	sufficient	taken
50:16	strenuously	16:5 23:8 33:15	50:24 59:4,7
stands	30:15	suggest	talking
42:21	strip	36:23 37:23 43:19	40:8,11
Stantec	32:4,17	44:6,10	tall
2:13 7:13 8:3	strongly	suggested	10:5 32:21
start	42:8	18:7 34:15 45:17	tax
12:5 48:5,6,17	struck	suggestion	35:24
state	30:17	57:11,12,13	taxes
23:20,22,24 43:9	structure	suggestions	40:9
statement	17:1	49:19	taxpayers
43:18 45:23	student	Suite	38:10
states	36:12	1:16	tell
43:21	students	Superintendent	52:9
state's	34:8,10,14 35:3 36:8	41:4	telling
23:18	36:11,19 37:7,11,16	supplement	33:2
stating	37:24 38:11 39:2	3:22	tells

16:11	55:1,5,7,10,15,20,22	24:21,22	turns
ten	thinking	totally	27:18,20
10:1 15:13 47:14	41:8 49:7 51:9,17	27:18 52:16 55:18	two
tenants	56:20	touch	12:3,10,11,12 29:14
24:16	third	38:21	32:8 33:18 36:12
tendency	24:1,21	town	37:20,21 39:7
53:14	thorough	1:10 4:3,7 20:20 21:11	two-facedness
tenets	30:1	21:24 22:8 26:8,10	23:24
44:4		26:10,19,22 28:7	two-week
	thought		
terms	45:7 51:1,12 54:20	29:13 31:5 32:4,18	5:15 53:15,16
39:15,19,21 41:20,22	thoughts	33:23 34:8 35:16	typically
42:4	48:8 51:15 52:19,21	36:7 38:9 39:15 40:2	14:20 17:13
testimony	53:2	40:7,22,24 41:14	U
42:10,15 43:16	three	42:3 44:7,14 45:14	ultimately
thank	50:4	46:7	12:1
6:7 10:5,6 17:22,23	Thursday	town's	unclear
18:14 20:13,15 29:10	11:6 19:10	17:1 32:24	
29:11 33:21,22 42:24	tight	traffic	14:10 44:5
42:24 43:2 44:12	32:2	23:3 25:10 27:11,12	understand
46:8,9 47:23,24 58:3	tightened	27:19 28:1 31:11,15	3:10 7:6 8:12 17:13
58:4	37:4	transcript	24:23 41:2,5 42:21
thanks	time	59:6	54:1 55:18
16:20	4:9 7:2 15:11 16:24	transportation	understandably
thing	19:17 20:23 22:3	25:10 27:12,13	52:16
32:3,8,17 40:11,21	25:9 42:16 45:3 49:4	trash	understanding
42:19 43:17 47:20	49:17 50:22 54:3,8	26:24 27:1,2,4,4,5,5,6	3:21,24 4:6
54:11,13 55:24	59:5	27:8	understands
things	timely	tree	10:23
4:4 5:15 10:20 24:7	19:3	16:6	undeveloped
29:21 31:19 33:19	times	trees	31:1,3,4 32:5
39:20 40:8 41:21	41:9 45:16	12:18 13:2,3,11 14:19	uneconomic
think	timidity	14:21,22,24 15:1,2,8	45:6,9,12,21 46:3
3:19 6:17 8:4 9:14,24	30:18	15:9,22 24:5	unfair
10:4,9,13,14,19	today	trouble	23:12,14,15 40:7
11:22 12:11 13:15	7:13 11:6 18:21 41:17	12:15	unit
14:9,11 16:15 17:20	53:6 54:4	true	25:4
20:4 21:9 22:5 23:5	today's	37:1 55:22 59:6,12	units
23:7,21 24:1,7,19	37:16	try	11:7,15,15,22,24 21:8
27:11,13,24 29:16	tomorrow	8:12 12:5 20:24 22:21	24:15 36:17 45:18
37:2 40:7,21,22 41:2	3:20,20 52:4	44:5	unrelated
41:12,18,20 42:6,13	tonight	trying	25:3
42:19,20 43:16,23	3:5 36:1 42:8	13:23 51:16 52:21	update
44:1 48:10 50:18	Tonights	54:1 56:4	4:2
51:4,5 52:8,16,24	18:6	turn	upheld
53:8 54:11,13,14,14	toothless	27:15 47:5 48:16	31:21 32:6,10 33:13
55.0 54.11,15,14,14	toumess	21.13 71.3 40.10	
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

T			
upset	6:13	22:11	28:16 29:2 38:14
54:20	waiver	welcome	working
upward	8:14 9:18,23 10:5,10	18:19	35:10
37:15	10:12,13,14,17 17:15	went	works
urge	waivers	30:7	19:22 55:22
39:2 42:8	9:8,10	weren't	worst
use	walking	17:8	45:24 46:8
10:2 24:16 26:1 55:12	15:7	we'll	wouldn't
useful	want	11:20,24 20:2,17	23:20
57:18	8:19 10:19 13:22 16:6	48:16 56:7	writing
usually	17:5 18:11,14,15	we're	29:15 33:19 44:15
30:24 32:12	19:8 22:3,11 23:22	5:14,19 13:23 19:2,24	54:9
30:24 32:12	,		
V	29:13 31:8 36:1 40:4	27:23 34:24 35:10	written
validity	44:15 47:20,21 48:18	36:13 40:8 41:11	18:19,24 21:1 25:7
22:16	50:17,23 52:20 56:10	42:7 47:5 48:10	42:12 49:22 50:12
valuable	57:9	52:22 57:2	57:16
28:18	wanted	we've	wrong
	10:20 21:2,4 30:22	5:18,19 13:4 17:3 18:5	52:23
value	33:15 48:20 56:18	26:12 27:1 30:16	wrote
40:14,19	wants	34:12 37:20 53:15	45:14
various	11:21 23:20	55:18,22	X
48:7,12 56:3	warned	wheat	
vehicles	38:1	13:24	XX
31:16	wash	when's	1:1
verification	26:22	6:24	Y
44:7	washing	William	-
versions	26:10	2:18	yard
48:12	Washington	willing	17:18
VFW	1:11	54:14	yards
22:19,21 23:10,20,23	wasn't	wish	47:6
Village	10:12 46:21	57:9	yeah
27:2 28:18 34:3 36:4,9	water	Wishinsky	8:16 49:8 50:17 54:11
36:18 38:3 46:20,21	26:4,6	2:22 43:3,3	year
visibility	way	withdraw	21:5 35:7 36:14 42:9
31:14	8:6,11 14:24 31:13,13	55:12	51:12 57:10
vision	32:1,1 48:9 51:6	wonder	years
40:22	ways	25:2 37:2	15:12,13,20,23 16:17
Volume	27:14	wondering	35:3 37:20,20 39:7
1:1	Wednesday	7:22 39:20,21 53:3	Year's
voluminous	19:16 20:12	Wong	19:11,13,16 20:15
56:2	week	2:21 39:5,6 42:7,17	7
vote	3:10 48:22 56:21 57:5	word	$\frac{\mathbf{Z}}{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{D}}$
35:17	weeks	55:13	ZBA
	9:6,7	work	21:14 29:8 34:12
W	weigh	6:3 12:16 13:1 27:24	44:22 45:2
waiting	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	0.0 12.10 10.1 21.27	ZBA's
	l		

36:23	36:11	22	
zone	13	1:9 22:20	5
12:18	31:6	22nd	5
zoning	15	3:5	44:1,2 56:13
1:5 17:5 30:4,7,12,19	17:4,6,13	243	5th
31:10 46:12 47:12	17.4,0,13 16	2:24 46:11	3:8 4:13 7:1 18:17
31:10 40:12 47:12 Zucker	21:7 29:13 44:14	2:24 40:11 249	20:2 56:18 59:13
			5:00
47:4	16-foot	2:18 20:19	18:23 20:13,15
Zuroff	17:3	250	50
2:6 19:21 53:17,18,22	17	38:11	34:23
55:1,2,21 57:6,8	39:7 54:23	262	542-0039
\$	176	2:19	1:18
\$16,000	9:16	3	542-2119
38:13	179	$\frac{3}{3}$	1:18
\$3.2	1:16	59:16	
38:15	18	3rd	6
	2:20		6
\$4	2	_ 45:24 _ 33	25:17
38:15	-		6th
0	2,600	26:3	1:11
02111	37:17,24 38:4	333	6,000-square-foot
1:17	20	1:11	47:17
02445	21:8	36	6.3
1:12	200	28:21	21:8 23:7
1:12	36:18 38:11	37	609
1	2005	26:7	52:1
1,000	34:14	4	617
35:3	2007	$\frac{4}{4}$	1:18,18
1,500	34:14	-	679
34:14	2011	25:11	36:10
1,800	21:18	4th	
37:16	20130094	19:15	7
1-59	1:6	40	7:00
1:2	2014	34:14 37:13 56:5 57:2	1:9 7:2
10	1:9	57:8,8	7:11
22:23,24 43:19,20,21	2015	40B	3:2
10-foot	56:13 59:13	1:7 13:9 21:23 34:3	
32:3,17	2017	36:3 38:18 40:12	8
*	59:16	44:3,4,20,23 45:24	8
11.8 21:7	2024	40-day	33:24 34:17 36:12
121:7 12	37:17	57:5	43:8
12 10:1	21	401	8:28
	25:10	1:16	58:5
121	21.66	44	800-foot
2:23	10:5	31:6	31:7,12 32:1
127			824
	ı	ı	ı

		1 490 21
36:8		
9		
9 24:14 9th 34:17		
34:17		
	1	